Save this

CHICAGO HISTORICAL SOCIETY
New Series

[*Please read, the Circulate.*]

FACTS FOR THE PEOPLE.

No. V.

THE FLORIDA WAR--ANOTHER VICTIM.

Many hearts were made to bleed by the recent intelligence, that the daughter of Mr. Griffin Tayler of this city, who had accompanied her husband, Lieutenant Montgomery, to the swamps of Florida, had been cruelly murdered by the Seminoles. The circumstances of this mournful event, as stated in an extract of a letter from an officer in Florida, published in the Republican, are these:—

"Yesterday, Dec. 28, about half past 9 o'clock, A. M., she started to go from this post to Fort Wakahoota, about nine miles, and to return from thence with Mrs. Hopson. Her husband was sick and unable to go with her, but she was accompanied by Lieut. Hopson, Lieut. Sherwood, and an escort of 11 mounted men. As this section of the country had been scouted thoroughly within the two past weeks, and as no Indian signs whatever had been discovered, it was thought that no Indians were about—that there was no danger, and that the escort was ample; indeed we had been passing to and fro over the same ground continually and often without escorts. Unhappily proved otherwise, however, and when within about three and a half miles from here, and about three quarters of an hour after they started, the party was attacked by a large body of Indians, and she killed together with Lieut. Sherwood—the Sergeant Major of the 7th, and three privates. She was shot below the back of the right shoulder, and the ball passed out of the right breast.—She died immediately.

Her poor husband is nearly distracted—no blame or reflection can be put on him—that he was not with her was alone owing to his being sick, or he certainly would have been along.

In a few minutes, as soon as the attack was made known to him, though barely able to ride, he mounted the horse of the man who reported it, and with a few men, was on the spot, so soon that the body was not at all mutilated. Commands were immediately sent out, too, but as yet the enemy has not been found. She was buried to-day at two o'clock, and at the grave the funeral service was read over her remains

Respectfully, your ob't servant,

FRANCIS LEE,
Captain Seventh Infantry.

P. S.—The Indians were come upon so quickly, that they did not even take the rings from her fingers, her gloves, or her comb."

This afflicting intelligence suggested to us the idea, that our readers would like to know something of the causes of a war, which has desolated so many homes, been carried on with such an extravagant expenditure of blood and treasure, and seems yet no nearer a successful termination, than when it was commenced under the administration of General Jackson. The account subjoined is taken from Jay's View, and will be read with deep interest, even by those who may have seen it before.

The Origin of the Florida War.

It will be recollected, that in 1817 the slaveholders complained that their fugitive slaves found a refuge in Florida, then belonging to the crown of Spain, and that, regardless of the obligations of neutrality, the Government had been sent by the Government up the river Apalachicola, to destroy a fort containing about 300 negro refugees, of whom were slaughtered. This territory was afterwards ceded to the United States; and for several years past, the Government has been waging a relentless and most disastrous war against its aboriginal inhabitants, with the avowed design of driving them from the Peninsula. It is not our design to write the history of this war, but merely to expose its true origin, and to explain the motives which have led the whites to insist on the expulsion of the Seminoles, and the causes which have induced the latter to offer a resistance unparalleled in savage warfare, for perseveting and desperate courage and ferocity.

The sacrifice on our part, of blood, of treasure, and of military honor in this war, is well known to be prodigious. THIRTY MILLIONS of dollars have already, it is said, been expended—our best generals have been baffled, and their laurels withered; and our troops have perished in great numbers, to contests with their savage foe, and by the sickliness of the climate. And yet no rational cause is assigned by the Government for this disastrous war. No reason is given why it is necessary, at all hazards, and at every expense, to drive the Seminoles from Florida. The whites are few in number, have far more land than they can occupy, and certainly do not want the wet and unwholesome everglades possessed by the Indians, and into which, we are told, white men can only penetrate at certain seasons of the year, without exposing their lives to almost certain destruction. But were the Seminoles so *numerous* that it was necessary to remove them, to make room for the whites, or so powerful as to render it unsafe to plant white settlements in Florida? We learn from official reports, that they numbered about 3000!* Major-General Jessup, the commanding officer of the army, and well acquainted with the existing condition of the Territory, in a letter to the Secretary of War, Feb. 11, 1838, makes the following candid avowal.

"We have committed the error of attempting to remove them (the Seminoles) when their lands were *not* required for agricultural purposes, when they were not in the way of the white inhabitants, and when the greater portion of their country was an unexplored wilder-

* I herewith enclose for your information, a copy of the general plan of operations which I have adopted for the removal of the Seminoles. 'I have assumed that the round number of three thousand embraces all of every description.'—*Wiley Thompson, Jr.*, Agent, Sept. 3, 1835. "I consider the population, including women not to exceed 6000—of which I should say 1500 are females."—*Joseph Harris*, Disbursing Agent of Florida Indians, Sept. 29, 1835.

HISTORICAL COLLECTION
Mrs. Emily Hitchcock

[*Please read, the circulate.*]

FACTS FOR THE PEOPLE.

No. V.

THE FLORIDA WAR—ANOTHER VICTIM.

Many hearts were made to bleed by the recent intelligence, that the daughter of Mr. Griffin Taylor of this city, who had accompanied her husband, Lieutenant Montgomery, to the swamps of Florida, had been cruelly murdered by the Seminoles. The circumstances of this mournful event, as stated in an extract of a letter from an officer in Florida, published in the Republican, are these:—

"Yesterday, Dec. 28, about half past 9 o'clock, A. M., she started to go from this post to Fort Wakahoote, about nine miles, and to return from thence with Mrs. Hopson. Her husband was sick and unable to go with her, but she was accompanied by Lieut. Hopson, Lieut. Sherwood, and an escort of 11 mounted men. As this section of the country had been scouted thoroughly within the two past weeks, and as no Indian signs whatever had been discovered, it was thought that no Indians were about—that there was no danger, and that the escort was ample; indeed we had been passing to and fro over the same ground continually and often without escorts. It unhappily proved otherwise, however, and when within about three and a half miles from here, and about three quarters of an hour after they started, the party was attacked by a large body of Indians, and she killed together with Lieut. Sherwood—the Sergeant Major of the 7th, and three privates. She was shot below the back of the right shoulder, and the ball passed out of the right breast.—She died immediately.

Her poor husband is nearly distracted—no blame or reflection can be put on him—that he was not with her was alone owing to his being sick, or he certainly would have been along.

In a few minutes, as soon as the attack was made known to him, though barely able to ride, he mounted the horse of the man who reported it, and with a few men, was on the spot, so soon that the body was not at all mutilated. Commands were immediately sent out, too, but as yet the enemy has not been found. She was buried to-day at two o'clock, and at the grave the funeral service was read over her remains.

Respectfully, your ob't servant,

FRANCIS LEE,
Captain Seventh Infantry.

P. S.—The Indians were come upon so quickly, that they did not even take the rings from her fingers, her gloves, or her comb."

This afflicting intelligence suggested to us the idea, that our readers would like to know something of the causes of a war, which has desolated so many homes, been carried on with such an extravagant expenditure of blood and treasure, and seems yet no nearer a successful termination, than when it was commenced under the administration of General Jackson. The account subjoined is ta[illegible] will be read with deep [illegible] from Jay's View, and who may have seen it be[illegible]est, even by those

The Origin of the Fl[illegible] War.

It will be recollected, that in 181[illegible] complained that their fugitive slaves [illegible] slaveholders Florida, then belonging to the crown of [illegible] refuge in regardless of the obligations of neutrality, and that, had been sent by the Government up the rive[illegible] force cola, to destroy a fort containing about 300 negr[illegible] chi- of whom were slaughtered. This territory wa[illegible] wards ceded to the United States; and for several [illegible] past, the Government has been waging a relentless [illegible] most disastrous war against its aboriginal inhabitants with the avowed design of driving them from the Peninsula. It is not our design to write the history of this war, but merely to expose its true origin, and to explain the motives which have led the whites to insist on the expulsion of the Seminoles, and the causes which have induced the latter to offer a resistance unparalleled in savage warfare, for persevering and desperate courage and ferocity.

The sacrifice on our part, of blood, of treasure, and of military honor in this war, is well known to be prodigious. THIRTY MILLIONS of dollars have already, it is said, been expended—our best generals have been baffled, and their laurels withered; and our troops have perished in great numbers, in contests with their savage foe, and by the sickliness of the climate. And yet no rational cause is assigned by the Government for this disastrous war. No reason is given why it is necessary, at all hazards, and at every expense, to drive the Seminoles from Florida. The whites are few in number, have far more land than they can occupy, and certainly do not want the wet and unwholesome everglades possessed by the Indians, and into which, we are told, white men can only penetrate at certain seasons of the year, without exposing their lives to almost certain destruction. But were the Seminoles so *numerous* that it was necessary to remove them, to make room for the whites, or so powerful as to render it unsafe to plant white settlements in Florida? We learn from official reports, that they numbered about 3000!* Major-General Jessup, the commanding officer of the army, and well acquainted with the existing condition of the Territory, in a letter to the Secretary of War, Feb. 11, 1838, makes the following candid avowal.

"We have committed the error of attempting to remove them (the Seminoles) when their lands were *not* required for agricultural purposes, when they were not in the way of the white inhabitants, and when the greater portion of their country was an unexplored wilder-

* I herewith enclose for your information, a copy of the general plan of operations which I have adopted for the removal of the Seminoles. I have assumed that the round number of three thousand embraces all of every description."—*Wiley Thompson, Jr.*, Agent, Sept. 3, 1835. "I consider the population, including negroes, not to exceed 6000—of which I should say 1600 are females."—*Joseph Harris*, Disbursing Agent of Florida Indians, Sept. 29, 1835.

ness, of the interior of which we were as ignorant as of the interior of China. . . . . I do not consider the country south of Chickasa Hatchee *worth the medicines* we shall expend in driving the Indians from it." Why, then, all this waste of blood and treasure? We answer —*to prevent fugitive slaves from finding an asylum among the Indians!*"

We well know how unwillingly this truth will be received by those among us who contend that the North has nothing to do with slavery; but we appeal to *facts* —and to facts about which there is and can be no dispute.

Florida borders upon two slave States, Alabama and Georgia, and is not far distant from two others, Mississippi and Louisiana. It is not, therefore, surprising that slaves from these States, escaping from their masters, should seek refuge in the huts of the Seminoles. We have already seen that the Federal Government have lately awarded upwards of $5000 to the gallant officers and seamen who destroyed 300 fugitive slaves in Florida, in 1816. The terrible example then made, was not, it seems, effectual; for in 1825, the War Department issued an order on the subject of fugitive slaves among the Seminoles, and the Indian Agent at Tallahasse was directed to take measures to enable the claimants to identify their property for its immediate restoration. "Let the Chiefs distinctly understand," wrote the Agent, agreeably to his instructions, "*that they are not to harbor runaway negroes;* and that they will be required to give up such negroes as are now residing within their limits."†

An Alabama paper, speaking of the war, makes the following confession: "It is the power to entice away and instruct in bush-fighting so many of our slaves, that we would wish to annihilate. *These Seminoles cannot remain in the Peninsula of Florida without threatening the internal safety of the South.*"

In 1834, a petition signed by about one hundred of the inhabitants of Alachua County, Florida, was presented to President Jackson, praying for his interposition against the Seminoles.

"While the lawless and indomitable people (says the petition) continue where they now are, the owners of slaves in our territory, and even in the States contiguous, cannot for a moment, in any thing like security, enjoy the possession of this *description of property.* Does a negro become tired of the service of his owner, he has only to flee to the Indian country, where he will find ample safety against pursuit. It is a fact which, if not susceptible of proof, is notwithstanding, and upon good ground, firmly believed, that there is at this time living under the protection of the Seminole Indians, a large number, probably more than one hundred slaves, who have absconded from their masters in the neighboring States and in Florida, since the treaty of Camp Moultrie. Within a few weeks several parties are known to have sought and found shelter in the nation where they continue secure against every effort of their owners to recover them . . . . There are, as it is believed, more than five hundred negroes residing with the Seminole Indians, four-fifths of whom are runaways, or descendants of runaways. . . . . It is perfectly obvious that during the existence of such a state of things, the interests of this fertile and promising section of Florida cannot flourish; and we are constrained to repeat, that there is no rational prospect for the better, so long as the *Indians are suffered to remain* in their present location."

The petition concludes with recommending "the immediate and efficient action of the government.‡"

† State papers, I Sess. 19 Cong., Vol. iv., Doc. 74, p. 82.

‡ 1 Sess., 24 Cong., Doc. 271.

In the spring of 1839, a sort of armistice was concluded with the Seminoles. This gave vast offence to slaveholders, and at a public meeting held at Tallahasse, it was resolved, "That the peninsula of Florida is the last place in the limits of the United States wherein the Indians should be *permitted to remain.*" For this assertion, the following among other reasons was assigned.

"*If located in Florida, all the runaway slaves will find refuge and protection with them.*"

The New Orleans Courier of 27th July, 1839, in reference to this same subject remarks, "Every year's delay in subduing the Seminoles, adds to the risk of their being joined by runaway slaves from the adjacent States, and increases the danger of a rising among the serviles."

SLAVERY, then, is the key which unlocks the enigma of the Florida war. To break up a refuge for runaway slaves, thirty millions more will be expended for the same object.

But it may be said, however satisfactorily the foregoing facts may account for the conduct of the Federal Government, they do not explain the astonishing and peculiar inveteracy manifested by these Seminoles towards the whites. Other tribes have without difficulty been removed to the west of the Mississippi; why then do these Indians alone offer a resistance to a superior power, more determined and more heroic than perhaps any recorded in history? Again does Slavery solve the difficulty.

It is very obvious that the Seminoles have been universally *exasperated.* Their extreme hatred to the whites, has unquestionably been owing in part to the gross and wicked frauds which they believe (with too much apparent reason) were practiced in the treaty of Payne's Landing, under which they were required to remove from Florida. But the great and prevailing cause of their deep seated hostility, is to be sought for in a long train of frauds and injuries of which they have been the victims, on account of their slaves; and likewise in the dread of Christian slavery, entertained by the negroes who belong to, or have joined the Seminoles.

Of all the hostile chiefs, the most active, persevering, and daring, was the celebrated OSCEOLA. It is said that this man's mother was seized and carried into Georgia as a slave, under pretence that she was the daughter of a fugitive negress. If this story, which has found its way into the public papers, be true, the wrongs of the mother have been terribly avenged by the son.

That the reader may understand the narrative we are about to lay before him, he must bear in mind that the Seminoles, like their more civilized neighbors, are slaveholders—but unlike them, they exercise their authority in such a manner as to render their slaves unwilling to leave them. The slaves are in fact little more than tenants of kind and familiar landlords, and regarded with horror the very idea of being transferred from their heathen to Christian masters. But there were many of the whites, who were exceedingly anxious to make the transfer. The agent, Wiley Thompson, thus wrote to the Secretary of War: (October 27, 1834.) "There are many *very likely* negroes in this nation. Some of the whites in the adjacent settlements manifest *a restless desire* to obtain them, and I have no doubt that Indian-raised negroes are now in possession of the whites."

The volume of documents submitted to Congress, 3d June, 1836, and entitled "Seminole hostilities," from which we quote, contains many illustrations of the agent's assertion; we can spare room for only a portion of them.

It appears that Conchattimico, a Florida chief, was the possessor of a number of slaves, the title to whom was disputed by another Indian, who sold his *claim* to a white man. The means taken by the purchaser to obtain the slaves, are thus described by the agent in his letter to the War Department, January 20, 1834.

"I was informed by the sub-agent, that Conchattimico sent a runner for him not long since; that he immediately repaired to the old chief's town, where he arrived in the night, and found the Indians and negroes greatly excited and in arms; and that very soon thereafter Vacca Pechassie, with fifteen or more of his warriors in arms arrived, for the purpose of aiding in resistance to a threatened violent attempt to force the slaves out of Conchattimico's possession. Persons interested in the adverse claim, were frequently seen hovering about the reserve; and the chief was informed that attempts had been made to bribe commanders of steamboats, on the river, to aid in accomplishing the capture of the slaves. . . . . Under such circumstances I could not but approve the order given by the sub-agent to Conchattimico, *to defend his property by force*, should a violent attempt be made to wrest it from him."

Shortly after this, Judge Cameron, of the United States' District Court, investigated the white man's claim to these slaves, and pronounced it groundless. Notwithstanding this decision, the claim was again *sold* to a company of whites, who resolved to relieve the chief of his property. But as the chief intended to protect it by force of arms, the enterprise was not free from danger. The expedient resorted to by the kidnappers is thus explained in a letter from the late Governor of the Territory to the Secretary of War, 23d May, 1836.

"I herewith transmit you a petition from the Indian chief Conchattimico, to be laid before Congress should you consider that necessary. Taking forcibly the slaves of this chief, after those men had created an alarm among the white inhabitants which resulted in *disarming* the Indians, was an outrage well calculated to rouse them to hostility. The alarm was *concerted* by these violators of all law, solely with the view of obtaining without danger of resistance, the slaves of the chief. I have no expectation the slaves referred to in the petition will ever be obtained, as I take it for granted they have been carried to a great distance and sold."

This Conchattimico was a *friendly* chief, having no intercourse with the hostile Seminoles; but on the report being raised that he was about to join the enemy, *he surrendered his arms* to quiet the apprehensions, real or affected, of his white neighbors. No sooner had he thus rendered himself defenceless, than a party of Georgians carried off his slaves, twenty in number, and valued at $15,000.

We have already seen how profitable it is for a Georgian to lose a slave among the Indians; but Congress has provided no fund to indemnify the Indian master for the slaves of which *he* may be robbed by Georgians.

Another friendly Florida chief, Pechassie, thus complains to the agent (28th July, 1835.) "I am induced to write to you in consequence of the depredations making, and attempted to be made on my farm, by a company of men, negro-stealers; some of whom are from Columbus, (Georgia,) and have connected themselves with Brown and Douglas. It is reported and believed by all the white people around here, that a large number of them will very shortly come down here, and attempt to take off Billy, Jim, Rose and her family, and others (slaves.) . . I should like to have your advice how I should act. I dislike to make any trouble, or have any difficulty with the white people; but if they will trespass on my premises, and on my rights, I must defend myself the best way I can. . . . . Please direct me how to act in this matter. Douglass and his company hired a man, who has *two large trained dogs for the purpose*, to come down and take Billy. The man came, but seeing he could do nothing alone, has gone off somewhere, probably to recruit. He is from Mobile, and follows for a livelihood catching runaway negroes with these large dogs."

By a letter from the United States Attorney, we find that Pechassie was subsequently "robbed of all the negroes he had, some six in number."

As these robberies were committed on friendly chiefs, and after the commencement of the Seminole war, they excited the attention and alarm of the officers of government, and hence probably it is that official notice was taken of them. They may give us some idea of the provocations which preceded and caused the war. Indeed the documents before us incidentally show, that the "likely negroes" of the Seminoles now in arms, were as strongly coveted by the whites, as the slaves of the friendly chiefs. By a treaty made with the Seminoles in 1832, the Federal Government with its usual solicitude for the interests of slaveholders, assumed the payment of all claims of slaveholders, assumed the property" to the amount of $7,000. A scramble of Indians for "slaves and other correspondence took place between the agent and the Secretary of War, respecting claims, and a voluminous correspondence appears that the Seminoles for Indian slaves; and it by the contrivances of the agent harassed for years slaves. The following is a sample of the wrongs to rob them of their Mrs. Hanna claimed a negro woman. It seems that a in possession of the Seminoles. The agent, and her increase, made known to the war department, claim had been the 8th of March, 1828, the following to long ago as issued to the Indian agent. "The Secretary had been rects that you forthwith deliver to Mary Hanna War direct her agent, the slaves claimed by her, and widow, imposing the obligation on her to abide by such bond as it may be esteemed proper to seek, in testing the question of ownership in the property in question." What here a specimen of the justice meted by our government to the Indians. A woman claims a slave in the possession of an Indian. Without the slightest inquiry into the justice of the claim, the property is ordered to be wrested forthwith from the possessor and delivered to the claimant, and then, as if in utter mockery, the woman is to give her bond to abide any decision that may hereafter be made as to the legality of her claim. Who is to obtain this decision? Certainly not the woman; and should the poor ignorant Indian go to law, where would he look for Mrs. Hanna or her slaves? From some cause not explained, the wicked and absurd order of the Secretary was not executed; and on the 2d of March, 1835, seven years after, a second order from the Secretary of War directed the agent "to afford whatever facilities may be in his power, upon the *claim being established by proper proof before the competent tribunal*, to have the property restored to Mrs. Hanna." Should the reader be struck with the remarkable moral difference between these two orders, the explanation is easy,—the office was filled at the time of the first order by a slaveholder; at the time of the second, by a northern gentleman. The agent now investigated the case, and it was discovered that the father of Mrs. Hanna, about the year 1815, had sold the woman in question, then full grown, to a Seminole, for forty steers, and had afterwards, as was alleged, given the same woman to his daughter; and on this pretended gift Mrs. Hanna claimed, not merely the woman, who had now lived twenty-five years with the Indians, but also all the children she had borne within that time!

On the 12th of December, 1834, the agent wrote to the Secretary, that a Seminole woman of the name of Nelly, inherited from her father "a considerable number of slaves," that a man named Floyd claims the whole of them by virtue of a bill of sale, and that Nelly insists that "Floyd imposed on her by presenting for her signature a bill of sale for all the negroes, instead of a written authority to him to recover some for her."* The agent adds, he has seen no one who pretends that Floyd paid

* A portion of them were claimed by another Indian.

her for the negroes, and that the universal impression is, that she was grossly imposed upon.

If civilized and Christian slaveholders are ready to murder, or, to use Mr. Preston's phrase, to *hang* abolitionists for questioning their moral right to hold property in man; we may judge what must have been the exasperation of the Seminoles at these multiplied attempts to rob them of their slaves.

There is still another mode in which slavery has operated to produce and continue the war in Florida. Although the expulsion of the Seminoles from the peninsula was devoutly desired by the whites, no inclination was felt to send their "likely negroes" to the west of the Mississippi. Of these negroes some were stolen, others claimed under fraudulent pretexts, and others it was proposed to purchase of their masters. General R. K. Call addressed a letter to President Jackson, (22 of March,) asking leave "to purchase *one hundred and fifty*" of the Seminole negroes. "These negroes," he affirms, "are violently opposed to leaving the country. If the Indians are permitted to convert them into *specie*, one great obstacle in the way of removal may be overcome." The applicant was informed that no permission was necessary—there being no legal prohibition to the Indians selling their slaves. Agents were forthwith dispatched to the nation, to buy up negroes. Mr. W. Thompson, the agent, however assumed the responsibility of prohibiting these agents from commencing their negotiations; and assigned his reasons in a very able letter to the Secretary of War (27th of April, 1835.) "The intercourse laws," he remarked, "prohibited the purchase of an Indian pony by a member of civilized society, without permission from the agent, and why? but because the Indian is considered in a state of pupilage, and incapable of protecting himself against the arts and wiles of civilized man. If the Indian's interest in a pony is of so much importance in the estimation of the government, as to require such strict guards to be thrown around it, the protection of his interest in his slave should be esteemed more important, by as much as the latter is more valuable than the former species of property. If in the regulation of the sale of ponies the United States exercise a rightful power, the obligation on them to guard the interest of the Indian in his slave, is greatly more imposing. The negroes in the nation dread the idea of being transferred from their present state of ease and comparative liberty, to bondage and hard labor, under overseers, on sugar and cotton plantations.

"They have always had a great influence over the Indians. They live in villages separate, and in many instances remote from their owners, and enjoying equal liberty with them, with the single exception that the slave supplies his owner annually from the product of his little field, with corn in proportion to the amount of the crop—in no instance that has come to my knowledge, exceeding ten bushels; the residue is considered the property of the slave. Many of these slaves have stocks of horses, cows and hogs, with which the Indian owner never assumes a right to intermeddle. I am thus particular on this point, that you may understand the true cause of the abhorrence of the negroes, of every idea of change. And the indulgence so extended to the slave, will enable you to credit the assertion, that an Indian would almost as soon sell his child as his slave, except when under the influence of intoxicating liquors."

We have here a picture of certainly a very extraordinary system of slavery. Slaves abhorring a change, and masters no more thinking of selling a slave than a child! But then those Indians were heathen, and perhaps it was from not adverting to this fact, that General Call took for granted they would be glad to convert men, women, and children into *specie*. President Jackson was equally inconsiderate. The agent was answered. "The President is of opinion, that the opportunity to sell their slaves will be an inducement for the Seminoles to remove. . . . Nor is it considered that the permission to the Indians to sell would be an inhuman act. It is not to be presumed the condition of these slaves would be worse than that of others in the same section of country."

To this presumption of executive philanthropy the agent forcibly replied, (June 17th, 1835,) "the remark in your letter that it is not to be presumed the condition of these slaves would be worse than that of others in the same section of country is true; yet you will agree with me, that the same remark would be applicable to myself, or any other individual in the U. States, as we should, if subjected to slavery, be in the precise condition of our fellow slaves. . . . . Any one at all acquainted with the condition of the negro, as connected with his Indian owner here, could not fail to admit that the change with him would be oppressively great." Mr. Thompson farther remarked to the Secretary of War, "if the department could be satisfied that the undeniable abhorrence of the negroes in this nation to the idea of being transferred from the present state of ease and comparative freedom, to sugar and cotton plantations, under the control of severe task-masters,† had been made to subserve the views of government, by inducing the negroes to exert their known influence over the Indians, through pledges made to them, accompanied by assurances that their removal west would, more than any thing else, serve to secure the existing relations between them and the Indians, then surely the department instead of classing them with the Indian skins and furs, would require a punctilious redemption of those pledges. I have not heard of a solitary Indian desiring the privilege to sell."

The President at last yielded, and the agent was authorised to prohibit any person entering the nation to buy slaves. But it was too late—the negroes well knew how anxious the whites were to possess them; and they reasonably feared that if the Indians were expelled, instead of being permitted to accompany their kind masters, they would be consigned to the cruel and detested service of Georgia and Alabama planters. Hence, impelled by the most powerful motives which can stimulate the heart and nerve the arm of man, they resisted to the utmost the emigration of their masters, and in the deadly struggle that ensued, evinced their devotion to the Indians, and their abhorrence of the whites by a ferocious and successful courage which may well send a thrill of fearful anticipation throughout the slave region.

We now submit to our readers whether the facts we have exhibited do not prove beyond all doubt that the blood and treasure expended in the Florida war, have been expended for the sole *purpose* of *breaking* up a refuge for *fugitive slaves*; and that the Seminoles have been goaded into their extraordinary and desperate resistance, by the frauds and *robberies* of *slaveholders?*

---

† Mr. Thompson was not an abolitionist, but had lately been a representative in Congress from the State of Georgia.

GEORGIA AND MICHIGAN.

Georgia contains a population over 700,000. Michigan numbers 211,005. The former is a century old; the latter 20 years. And yet Michigan has nearly as many newspapers and printing establishments as Georgia. The following we copy from the census returns.

Georgia.—Binderies, 3; printing offices, 20; daily newspapers, 5; weekly, 20; semi and tri-weekly, 3; men employed, 139.

Michigan.—Binderies, 2; printing offices, 20; weekly newspapers, 20; daily, 3; men employed, 130.

Such are the effects of slavery and freedom on the mental activity of a people, and on their sources of intelligence.

EFFECTS OF SLAVERY ON NATIONAL PROSPERITY.

BY T. F. MARSHALL OF KENTUCKY.

Extract from a late publication in the Frankfort Commonwealth, Kentucky.

I have said that I considered negro slavery as a political misfortune. The phrase was too mild. It is a cancer—a slow, consuming cancer—a withering pestilence—an unmitigated curse. I speak not in the spirit of a puling and false philanthropy. I was born in a slave State—I was nursed by a slave—my life has been saved by a slave. To me, custom has made the relation familiar, and I see nothing horrible in it. I am a Virginian by descent.—Every cross in my blood, so far as I can trace it, in the paternal or maternal line, is Virginian. It is the only State in the Union in which I ever resided, save in Kentucky. I was never north of the Chesapeake Bay. My friends, my family, my sympathies, my habits, my education, are Virginian. Yet I consider negro slavery as a political cancer and a curse. And she taught me so to consider it. Hear her own declarations—ponder on her history—look at her present condition.

The delegates and representatives of the good people of Virginia, in convention assembled, on the 27th of June, 1776, in the preamble to their first constitution, containing the memorable declaration against the government of George III, of England, and setting forth their grievances, among others, present the following as cause of rebellion and dismemberment from the British empire, that the aforesaid George had endeavored to pervert his kingly office "into a detestable and insupportable tyranny," by "prompting our negroes to rise in arms against us—"those very negroes whom, by an inhuman use of his "negative, he had refused us permission to exclude by law"—see preamble to amended Constitution of Virginia. One of the causes, then, of the American revolution, at least in Virginia, was the 'inhuman" refusal of the British crown, to ratify a law prohibiting the importation of slaves. I have shown in my first number, that almost the first use made by that venerable and renowned Commonwealth of her newly acquired liberty, was an effort to arrest, by legislation, the increase of that tremendous evil of which she complains so bitterly against the King. In 1790, just after the adoption of the Federal Constitution, that point of time which forms the true starting post of these States, in the race of nations, what was the situation of Virginia? Occupying the most central position upon the American seaboard—having the greatest extent of coast in the Union—stretching from the Chesapeake Bay to the line of North Carolina, and from the Atlantic ocean to the Ohio river—covering a surface of 70,000 square miles—embracing under the mildest latitudes the greatest varieties of soil—prolific of the richest and most dissimilar products—intersected in every direction by the noblest navigable streams, connecting her mountains on the one side with the Ocean, on the other with the bright waters of the Ohio—she seemed to comprehend within herself all the elements of empire. Nature never spread out a fairer, a nobler theatre for the enterprising genius of liberty and industry, than the State of Virginia.—In the diversified productions of the different portions of her extended territory, there were laid the foundations of the largest domestic trade of any State in the world. Abounding in minerals of every species, from gold to lead, with the finest salt wells on the continent, her valleys teeming with grass and grain, and her lowlands giving her a monopoly in the then richest staple of the planting States, what more could she ask at the hand of Heaven? Did she want manufactures? She had the finest water power, the most abundant materials, and the easiest communications. Did she desire foreign commerce? The ocean lay before her, and the inlet of the Chesapeake, meeting the waters of her own Potomac, washed her entire eastern border. Behind, and touching her, lay the great valley of the west—the fairest portion of it once her own—that valley which was competent to sustain countless millions of men—which was destined to comprehend within its capacious bosom many States—States whose consumption is even now incalculable, and whose powers of purchase and payment far exceed even their vast demand. This trade which sustains the commerce of Pennsylvania and New York, and the manufactures of New England—this enormous trade, which is still in its infancy, but which, even in its cradle, is competent to absorb and digest the capital—to keep in full and profitable employment the commercial industry of cities containing more free people than are to be found in all the broad territories of the Old Dominion—might, and should have been, all her own. It seemed indeed to be designed for her by nature, and to have tempted her by every inducement of circumstance and position. She had but to extend her arm and grasp it with all its treasures in full monopoly. Through the Ohio River, and her western streams, it was brought home, to the very foot of her mountains—that barrier passed, and it was poured through various channels, dividing and watering her whole eastern territory, into the bosom of the Atlantic. No State lay so convenient—to none were presented so many facilities, and so few difficulties, in the acquisition and the entire command of the trade of the West. Did she lack the intellect to perceive—the genius to comprehend her position and her interest? Oh, no! *Magna mater virum*, she had produced a race of men "with minds to comprehend the Universe"—men whose names and actions placed Virginia first in fame, as she was in power and position among the States, and threw a splendor over her early history, which still shines in lingering and melancholy radiance round her worn and faded brow—"a gilded halo, hovering o'er decay." They saw, and would have seized, all her advantages. George Washington, great in all things, and having stretched before his prophetic vision in long perspective, the future fortunes of the empire he had founded, warned Virginia of the importance of the West. He first projected the connexion of the Chesapeake with the Ohio river, through means of the waters of the Potomac and Monongahela. They lacked not the intelligence. Had other States the start of her in population? Let us compare Virginia with New York, the only State which could challenge a comparison with her.

In 1790, Virginia with 70,000 square miles of territory and internal resources, such as I have described, contained a population of 749,308. New York upon a surface of 45,558 square miles contained a population of 340,120. This statement exhibits in favor of Virginia a difference of 24,242 square miles of territory, and 408 188 in population, which is the double of New York, and 68,600 more. In 1830, after a race of forty years, Virginia is found to contain 1,211,405 souls, and New York 1,918,608, which exhibits a difference in favor of New York of 607,203. The increase upon the part of Virginia will be perceived to be 463,187, starting from a basis more than double as large as that of New York'—The increase of New York, upon a basis of 340,120, has been 1,578,391 human beings. Virginia has increased in a ratio of 61 per cent., and New York in that of five hundred and sixty six per cent. What the next census will show we cannot tell. The total amount of property in Virginia, under the assessment of 1838, was $211,930,508 08 1-2. The aggregate valuation of real and personal property, in New York, in 1839, was $654 000,000, exhibiting an excess in New York over Virginia, of capital, of $442,069,492. Statesman may differ about policy, or the means to be employed in the promotion of the public good, but surely they ought to be

agreed as to what prosperity means. I think there can be no dispute that New York is a greater, richer, a more thriving, prosperous, and powerful State than Virginia. What has occasioned the difference? We have already seen that, as to advantages merely physical—as to all the original elements of grandeur, wealth and power—Virginia was unsurpassed. Has accident or misfortune operated in this case? Has a despotic government bowed the spirit and cramped the efforts of Virginia? Has she suffered under the desolations of war or scourge of pestilence? Over this fair land, a balmy atmosphere and purest skies smile health and cheerfulness. Healing fountains of mineral and medicinal waters burst from her mountains. The most delicious baths, the most salubrious springs, tempt from every land the pilgrims of affliction and disease. With war she has nothing to do; against its dangers, its horrors, or its burdens, she has no provisions to make. Her government and people are not charged with the care or expenses incident to defence. The broad shield of the Union is spread before her. The potent arm of that government which combines the strength and revenues of twenty six States, and wields the whole for the protection of each, is pledged to maintain her rights and her safety against all the world.—There is but one explanation of the facts I have shown. There is but one cause commensurate with the effects produced. The clog which has staid the march of her people, the incubus which has weighed down her enterprize, strangled her commerce, kept sealed her exhaustless fountains of mineral wealth, and paralyzed her arts, manufactures and improvement, is negro slavery. This is the cancer which has corroded her revenues, laid waste her lowlands, banished her citizens, and swallowed up her productions. This is the slumbering volcano which will bear no handling. The smallest breath to fan, the slightest threat to stir its sleeping, but unextinguished fires, drives her to madness. Oh! well might she curse the tyrant who planted this dark plague spot upon her virgin bosom.

I have given the total population of Virginia, at the two periods, and shown the total increase. Let us examine the relative fortunes of the two races as to their numerical progress. In 1700, there were of whites 544, 881; in 1830, 741,648, showing an increase in forty years, of 186,967, or about 36 per cent. a little over one third. In 1790, the slave population amounted to 203, 427—in 1830, to 469,757, showing an increase within the same period, of 266,230 blacks, being one hundred and thirty three per cent. increase on the original number.

If we examine the other slave states, we shall perceive, the same principle at work. In North Carolina, the black population has increased in the ratio of one hundred and forty five per cent.; and in South Carolina, about three hundred per cent. In the former State, the whites have increased in ratio of about thirty per cent. In the latter a little over eighty per cent. Throughout, it will be found on examination, that within the period embraced by the census, being forty years, the black population has increased within the slave States, faster than the white, and comparing the slave States with the free, that the total population increases in the latter with far more rapidity than the former. The slave States of this Union, at the last census, contained five millions of people, of which two were black. The free States contained eight millions of whites, Eight to three, is the proportion between the whites, in these two sections of the United States.

It is in vain to say, that the tremendous difference already indicated in the growth of Virginia and New York, was the result fof the soil of Virginia—that her lowlands are poor and exhausted. They were not always so. One hundred years ago, and Virginia below the mountains, was the most desirable portion of America. Her condition in 1790, proves how much she had been preferred, and how vastly she had got the start of all the colonies. Her present poverty and exhaustion, are the result of the system of slave cultivation—the most slovenly and the least productive of any. The skilful and prudent husbandry which has made the rocky and inhospitable regions of New England, adequate to the support of two millions of people, would have preserved the plains of Old Virginia in their original fertility. But the reason, such as it is, cannot apply to Kentucky. Compare her with Ohio or Indiana. She, too, has her mineral mountains—her sealed up fountains of wealth—her thousand sources of capital unopened—but who shall say that her soil is exhausted? "Here grain, and flower, and fruit, gush from the earth until the land runs o'er." Yet compare her, all lovely as she is, with Ohio in all the elements of social strength and political power, and tell me the results and reason? Whether, then, we compare the planting with the grain-growing States, or the grain-growing States with each other; throw but this ingredient of slavery into one, and I care not whether they be equal in all other respects, or whether the slave States have every other advantage, the fatal influence of this poison is immediately perceived. In 1790, Ohio was a wilderness. In 1840, if her population bear the same proportion to ours that her votes do, she thribbles us in people, and numbers two millions. The tolls from her canals amount to $594,204—about double our whole revenue. Her representation in Congress will be in proportion to her people. But why compare her with Kentucky! With the restless and unpausing energy which belongs to a community entirely free, she has passed us long since.—She will now take her station, third in the Union, and Virginia, who twenty years ago stood first in power and place—Virginia, the nursery of Presidents, the mother of States, the proud, the chivalric, must yield up her honors, and quietly fall in the rear of this creation of of yesterday. Verily, these same "Goths and Vandals"—the free mechanics and artisans, the objects of Mr. Wickliffe's classic horror—are the most renowned of conquerors. "No dangers daunt them, and no labors tire."—They cut through mountains—they hew down forests—they build up cities—they connect the ocean with the lake, the lakes with the rivers—they conquer time and space—they subject nature, throughout all her kingdoms and in all her elements, to the uses of men, and men multiply and population bounds forward, to meet and enjoy the supplies thus furnished by their victorious industry. A comparison of the history and progress of the States of this Union, leaves no doubt of the fact that, in all that constitutes greatness and power in a community—in wealth, in population, in industry, in fiscal resources to the government, in multiplied employments, and extended and diffused comforts and intelligence among the great mass of the people—I say, there is no doubt that, in all these particulars, the advance of the free States has been wonderfully the most rapid, and the distance is widening at every observation that is taken. I have ascribed it to negro slavery. What other circumstance is there that is peculiar to the one section of the Union, to which this remarkable difference in progressive power can be ascribed? If we would examine philosophically into the process of production, the sources of wealth, and the principles of population, we should doubtless find the principle here, as in every thing else, to correspond with and explain the fact.

I have run out these papers to such unreasonable length, that I have not room to trace the *modus operandi* of slavery throughout all its details. That the law of 1833, combined with other circumstances, has had a tendency to check its advance in Kentucky, and to keep it stationary for the last ten years, is admitted by the enemies of the law, and proven by the statistics of the

country. That the repeal of that law would give a stupendous impulse to its increase, is equally admitted and desired, by those who seek its repeal, and is too obvious for argument. Between these opposite views of policy the country must decide. There are persons who say they desire a modification of the law, so as to permit citizens of the State to introduce slaves for their own use, but still to prohibit their importation as merchandize. This appears to me to be trifling with the subject. If it be the policy of Kentucky, to prevent, so far as she may, by legislation, the increase of slaves within her borders, without violating the constitutional rights of masters and emigrants, then the law as it stands, is adapted to the policy. If that be not her policy, why then repeal it altogether. Where is the difference between permitting every body that wants slaves to introduce them for their own use, and permitting traders to bring them in for sale! The traders would bring them in for the use of citizens, and would bring in no more than would be purchased for such use. Prohibit the trader from selling, but allow the citizen who desired to import, and he will appoint the trader his agent to import for him, and pay him a commission, instead of buying from him. We will be thrown back upon the law of 1815, which had no effect at all. If the law of 1833 had been passed in 1800, and enforced, Kentucky, without violating the rights of any body, would have so reduced the evil, that it would have terminated of itself, or could have been easily done by the act of the masters, or the purchase by the Commonwealth. But Mr. Wickliffe styles me an abolitionist. He calls slavery a blessing. Will the slaveholders in Kentucky answer his appeal, and fall in with his reasoning? Will they repeal this statute—call a convention of the slave States—break down all restrictions on the free importation of slaves from every point of the compass where slavery lies! Mississippi has overtraded herself in slaves—shall she throw back that excess upon us! And will the slaveholders do this—not to advance their wealth—not to improve the face of their country—not to introduce new branches of industry—not to invite skill, intelligence, and capital, and improvement, social, moral, or physical—but to keep out manufactures, and artisans! Will they bring in the vicious, degraded, brutal, unproductive, and unimprovable African slave, from Virginia and Carolina!—a race which has brought down upon those States the double curse of weakness and danger—a race from which Virginia would have extricated herself while it was yet possible, if she had been permitted—a race which was inflicted and rivetted upon her by a foreign tyrant era she was yet free!—will they bring them here as an ally and an instrument, by which to lower the wages of labor, when those very wages are the highest indication of an advancing society and improving condition, and the surest means in the power of the State of retaining her citizens within her bosom, of stopping the tide of emigration, and alluring back its current? Will they enlist the African race to keep out and to drive out their own? And for what are they persuaded to do this unnatural thing? To render themselves and their property more secure against the attacks of the abolitionists. Is South Carolina more secure with her 315,000 slaves to 265,000 citizens? If, as Mr. Wickliffe charges, the British Government is leagued with the Abolitionists to destroy the tenure of slavery, is it a wise measure of defence to increase the number of that domestic foe, till it exceeds your own? The idea and argument appear to me to border on madness.

SLAVE-IMPORTATION LAW.

We copy the following notice of proceedings in the House of Representatives, Kentucky, January 9,

From the Frankfort Commonwealth.

"The House again went into committee of the whole, N. Thompson in the chair, on the bill to repeal the law prohibiting the importation of slaves into this State, approved February 2, 1833, and for other purposes: and after some time spent in committee, the speaker resumed the Chair, when Mr. Thompson reported that the committee had, according to order, had under consideration the bill aforesaid, and had instructed him to report the same to the House, with an amendment thereto, which he had handed in at the clerk's table.

The bill was read. The amendments proposed by the committee for Courts of Justice, were also read, And the substitute proposed by Mr. Clay, was likewise read.

The amendment proposed by the committee of the whole, was to strike out the enacting clause.

Mr. Furman then called for the previous question—the call was sustained, and the main question was put, shall the enacting clause of said bill be struck out. Decided in the affirmative.

Yeas, 53; nays, 34. So the bill was rejected."

Last year, the bill passed the House, we believe, by a small majority, but was negatived in the Senate. This year, a strong majority appears against it in the House. We do not claim, that Abolitionism has produced this change. But, we do claim, that the legislature of Kentucky are not the men to be frightened, by a foolish clamor about Abolitionists, from the discussion of the question of slavery, or any policy in regard to it, they may see proper to take. Our neighbor of the Republican, who knows as little of slavery as he does of abolition, said a few days ago in his paper, if the law of 1833 should be repealed, Abolitionists might thank themselves for it. What says he now?

We may remark, that, a bill similar to that rejected in the House, has been introduced in the Senate of Kentucky. Its fate is pretty certain, we suppose.

PUTTING BACK EMANCIPATION.

No charge has been more confidently hurled against anti-slavery men, than, that their efforts have put back the cause of Emancipation, especially in Kentucky. Years ago, it is said, the general feeling in that State was in favor of terminating slavery, but the turmoil occasioned by abolitionism produced a most unfavorable revulsion of public opinion, and the chain of the slave was rivetted faster than ever.

We never were convinced by such declamation, for the best of all reasons—we saw no reason in it; no proof of the assertion was pretended to be offered. Had the charge been true to a certain extent, it would have failed to convince us that we were wrong. The feeling that existed in Kentucky, before the era of abolition, and the general ignorance of the best mode of remedying the evil of slavery, would, in our estimation, have prevented the adoption of any

judicious, efficient plan of emancipation. But, we repeat, we do not believe there was a particle of truth in the objection. And the late discussions in our sister state has revealed facts, which will satisfy any candid mind, that abolitionism had very little to do with the apparent subsidence of anti-slavery feeling which took place a few years since.

It seems, that Kentucky largely partook of the apprehension excited in the southern states by the Southampton insurrection, and the Emancipationists availed themselves of the occasion to press on the public mind the necessity of getting rid of slavery.

This aroused the feelings of those who were deeply interested in its support. To a superficial observer, it must have seemed, that the prospect of emancipation was brightening every day. But, the conservatives, as they are called, interposed with their compromise—the law of 1833—securing to the slavery men their present rights, gratifying the emancipationists by arresting the progress of the evil.

Excitement was lulled. The contest ceased, or at least was not carried on openly. There seemed to be a general agreement to stand still and be silent. Just at that time, abolitionism began to be prominent, arousing fierce prejudices, convulsing the community with excitement. What more natural, than to connect the lull in Kentucky with the storm of abolitionism in the free states? They were coincident, in point of time, and it was no wonder that superficial persons, especially in their wrath against abolitionism, should ascribe to its influence the stagnation of anti-slavery sentiment in Kentucky. Did they judge righteous judgment? Let the facts, just related, answer.

The late discussions in Kentucky show, that there is that in the character of our neighbors, which would scorn to be turned aside from the path of true interest, because a class of men, undeservedly odious, had insisted that such was the right path. He who acts against his own interests, to spite one whom he dislikes, shows more childishness, than magnanimity: such weakness we cannot charge on the character of Kentuckians.

POPULATION AND RELATIVE POSITION OF VIRGINIA.

There is no part of the American Union upon which one who is familiar with American History looks with more interest than Virginia. It was the "Ancient Dominion." It is the mother of States, and the grave of Washington. If Virginia counted her own she would include Kentucky, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan and Wisconsin; for over all these her jurisdiction once extended, and including herself make up a population of five millions. Now, shorn of her strength, she falls behind her daughter Ohio! In 1830, Ohio was the fourth State, now she is the third; and another generation will see it the first! But Virginia, alas! stops on the shore to see others glide by!

We have before us the census of Virginia for 1840, and it presents some curious results.

Population of Eastern Virginia lying east of the Blue Ridge,	798,607
West of do.	432,837
	1,231,444
Increase since 1840,	20,038
Whites,	735,831
Slaves,	447,207
Free Blacks,	48,425
Increase of whites,	41,373
" Free Blacks,	1,322
Decrease of Slaves,	22,657
In 1830, excess of Whites over Slaves,	224,715
In 1840,	288,605

The increase of whites is six per cent; the decrease of slaves four per cent.

In order to prevent the gradual change which has come over Virginia, in respect to slavery, we give the following table:

1790 to 1800,	slave increase	19	per cent.
1800 to 1810,	"	13	"
1810 to 1820,	"	8	"
1820 to 1830,	"	10	"
1830 to 1840,	" *decrease*	4	"

The balance is thus effectually cast against slavery in Virginia; and its extinction there is certain.

The comparison between Eastern and Western Virginia is equally curious.

Western Virginia—increase,	54,544
Eastern Virginia—decrease,	34,372
Western Virginia—slaves,	53,713
Eastern Virginia—slaves,	393,494

The results are remarkable, and show the certain action of the same cause.

In Western Virginia there are 28,624 persons who cannot read, over 21 years of age! How many there are in the Eastern part of the State we do not know. The proportion in Western Virginia is more than one-sixth the whole number.—*Cincinnati Chronicle.*

David Bo

FACTS FOR PEOPLE.

No

THE FLORIDA WAR—HIGHLY IMPORTANT DOCUMENT.

In the spring of 1837, the country heard with joy the announcement that the Florida war was at last ended. March 6th, Major General Jesup concluded a treaty of peace with the Seminoles, whereby they bound themselves and their allies to go to the country assigned them by the President of the United States, and the faith of the government was pledged to secure them in person and property, and pay all the expenses of their removal. In less than three months the scene changed. Micanopy and the other chiefs held as hostages were abducted June 2nd, and hostilities broke out afresh. Bitter reproaches were heaped on the heads of the savages, and the press groaned over their faithlessness and cruelty. Few, except abolitionists, thought of blaming the whites, and even they felt unable to demonstrate the true causes of this calamitous event.

The late speech in Congress of Mr. Giddings, an able and fearless representative from this state, will, undoubtedly, when published, shed abundance of light on this subject. Meanwhile, that our readers may not be kept wholly in the dark, we shall make some use of an important congressional document, just transmitted to us by this gentleman, and for which he will please accept our cordial thanks.

The fifth article of the treaty or convention entered into by General Jesup with the Seminoles, is as follows:

"Art. 5. Major General Jesup, in behalf of the United States, agrees that the Seminoles and their allies, who come in and emigrate to the West, shall be secure in their lives and property; that their negroes, their *bona fide* property, shall accompany them to the West; and that their cattle and ponies shall be paid for by the United States, at a fair valuation."

The other articles provide simply for the cessation of hostilities, the removal of the Indians, the manner of their removal, the payment of its expenses, and the giving of hostages; and guaranty to the Seminoles all the advantages secured to them by the treaty of Payne's landing.

Previous to and during the war, many slaves owned by citizens of the United States had ab-

and taken refuge among the Indians; ing hostilities, captures had been made on both sides. *The treaty contained ation in regard to these matters.* No n whatsoever was made for indemnior restitution, by either of the parties. less, in guarantying to the Indians negroes should accompany them— raseology was used, ("*their bona fide* ") as might admit of a construction ircumstances. Who was to determine, groes were, and were not, "their bona perty?"

treaty thus made, without any such stipas are alluded to above, was most cerliberal one, and a wise one too, had fifth article been so framed, as to leave door for imposition on the Indians. ess liberal would not have been acceded e commanding general, in writing to r General Jones, Washington City,

ave attempted the exaction of severe ight have led to a renewal of hostilities, millions might have been expended, y valuable lives lost by exposure to the s well as the arms of the enemy."

he General calculated the peace he had ould be permanent, appears from severin the Document before us.

tter to Brigadier General Jones, March says—"I now for the first time have myself to believe the war at an end."

* * * *

anopy informed me last night, that he r consented before to emigrate; but he eved that the Great Spirit had so order he should leave the land of his fathers, ubmitted cheerfully."

29th, he writes to Col. John Warren e is no disposition on the part of the y of the Indians, to renew hostilities. r addressed to Governor Call, April remarks—"If the citizens of the Terprudent, the war may be considered at

is nothing in the whole document to t the commanding officer distrusted the

FACTS FOR THE PEOPLE.

No. VI.

THE FLORIDA WAR—HIGHLY IMPORTANT DOCUMENT.

In the spring of 1837, the country heard with joy the announcement that the Florida war was at last ended. March 6th, Major General Jesup concluded a treaty of peace with the Seminoles, whereby they bound themselves and their allies to go to the country assigned them by the President of the United States, and the faith of the government was pledged to secure them in person and property, and pay all the expenses of their removal. In less than three months the scene changed. Micanopy and the other chiefs held as hostages were abducted June 2nd, and hostilities broke out afresh. Bitter reproaches were heaped on the heads of the savages, and the press groaned over their faithlessness and cruelty. Few, except abolitionists, thought of blaming the whites, and even they felt unable to demonstrate the true causes of this calamitous event.

The late speech in Congress of Mr. Giddings, an able and fearless representative from this state, will, undoubtedly, when published, shed abundance of light on this subject. Meanwhile, that our readers may not be kept wholly in the dark, we shall make some use of an important congressional document, just transmitted to us by this gentleman, and for which he will please accept our cordial thanks.

The fifth article of the treaty or convention entered into by General Jesup with the Seminoles, is as follows·

"Art. 5. Major General Jesup, in behalf of the United States, agrees that the Seminoles and their allies, who come in and emigrate to the West, shall be secure in their lives and property; that their negroes, their *bona fide* property, shall accompany them to the West; and that their cattle and ponies shall be paid for by the United States, at a fair valuation."

The other articles provide simply for the cessation of hostilities, the removal of the Indians, the manner of their removal, the payment of its expenses, and the giving of hostages; and guaranty to the Seminoles all the advantages secured to them by the treaty of Payne's landing.

Previous to and during the war, many slaves owned by citizens of the United States had absconded, and taken refuge among the Indians; and during hostilities, captures had been made of slaves on both sides. *The treaty contained no stipulation in regard to these matters.* No provision whatsoever was made for indemnification, or restitution, by either of the parties. Nevertheless, in guarantying to the Indians that their negroes should accompany them—such phraseology was used, (*"their bona fide property,"*) as might admit of a construction to suit circumstances. Who was to determine, what negroes were, and were not, "their bona fide property?"

The treaty thus made, without any such stipulations, as are alluded to above, was most certainly a liberal one, and a wise one too, had not the fifth article been so framed, as to leave open a door for imposition on the Indians. Terms less liberal would not have been acceded to. The commanding general, in writing to Brigadier General Jones, Washington City, says—

"To have attempted the exaction of severe terms might have led to a renewal of hostilities, by which millions might have been expended, and many valuable lives lost by exposure to the climate as well as the arms of the enemy."

That the General calculated the peace he had made, would be permanent, appears from several letters in the Document before us.

In a letter to Brigadier General Jones, March 18th, he says—"I now for the first time have allowed myself to believe the war at an end."

* * * *

"Micanopy informed me last night, that he had never consented before to emigrate; but he now believed that the Great Spirit had so ordered, that he should leave the land of his fathers, and he submitted cheerfully."

March 29th, he writes to Col. John Warren —"There is no dispositiou on the part of the great body of the Indians, to renew hostilities. In a letter addressed to Governor Call, April 18th, he remarks—"If the citizens of the Territory be prudent, the war may be considered at an end."

There is nothing in the whole document to show that the commanding officer distrusted the

Indians; but he had serious apprehensions of difficulties, growing out of the cupidity of the whites, and their determination to interfere with the negro property of the Seminoles. No sooner was the treaty concluded, than there seemed to be a general rush upon the Indians. Claims for fugitive and captured slaves were pushed with the greatest zeal, and of course no great discrimination was thought necessary, in urging them against a ruthless tribe of savages who had desolated the country. It would seem from reading the correspondence in this Document, that the slaveholders and kidnappers took it for granted, that the war had been waged alone for their special benefit, and thought every thing lost, except they could seize the negroes among the Indians. Their cupidity, giving birth as it may well be presumed, to violent seizures, and fraudulent claims, as well as to premature efforts to recover slaves really belonging to them, together with the misconduct of General Jesup, was the real cause of the renewal of hostilities. The convention was violated *first* on the part of the United States, and their citizens. To prove this position, we shall make numerous extracts from the correspondence before us.

In the letter of March 18th, 1837, to Brigadier General Jones referred to above, after stating that he now for the first time allowed himself to believe the war at an end, General Jesup continues—

"The same errors, however, that renewed the war in Alabama, would renew it here—I mean, the imprudent violence of the citizens. Should they attempt to seize any of the Indians, as criminals or debtors, the scenes of the last year will be renewed. If it should become necessary to protect them from such annoyance, I shall not hesitate to declare martial law, and send every individual, not connected with the public service, out of the country."

March 21st, 1837, J. A. Chambers, writing to Major Thomas Childs, by order of the commanding general, directs that a certain "Col. Dill," who had arrived at the post of the latter officer, in quest of slaves, be "required to return to whence he came, with all convenient despatch." "The necessity of this order," he adds, "and the strict enforcement of it, arise from the certainty, that if persons come forward at this time to urge their claims to negroes, it will evidently have the effect, to prevent the negroes from coming in; and if they do not come in, the commanding general is decidedly of opinion, that the Indians themselves will be greatly delayed, if not entirely prevented from a compliance with the terms of the Convention." The opinion of Jeneral Jessup was founded upon his knowledge of the vast influence exerted by the negroes over their masters.

March 27th, General Jesup writing from Fort Dade, to Lieutenant Col. S. Miller, says; —"I have also been informed that Mr. Cooley's business at Tampa Bay, is to look after negroes. If that be so, he must be sent away; a trifling circumstance would light up the war again. Any interference with the negroes, which would produce alarm on their part, would inevitably deprive us of all the advantages we have gained. I sympathize with Mr. Cooley, in his afflictions and losses, but, responsible as I am for the peace of the country, I cannot and will not permit that peace to be jeoperded by his imprudence."

March 29th, the General writes from Fort Dade, to Col. J. Warren—

"There is no disposition on the part of the great body of the Indians to renew hostilities, and they will, I am sure, faithfully fulfil their engagements, if the inhabitants of the Territory be prudent; but any attempt to seize their negroes or other property, would be followed by an instant resort to arms. *I have some hopes of inducing both the Indians and Indian negroes to unite in bringing in the negroes taken from the citizens during the war.*"

We have seen that the imprudence of the whites was endangering the peace. The sentence marked in italics shows that the General himself had now commenced a policy no less dangerous than their imprudence. It was no part of the capitulation, that the Indians should be called upon to restore fugitive or captured slaves, or interfere in any way for their restoration. This gave serious umbrage to the slaveholders. A few days after the formation of the treaty of peace, a treaty subsequently sanctioned in all its parts by the government, seven citizens of Florida, temporarily in Charleston, S. C., met together there, to protest against it. In a letter dated March 18th, 1837, addressed to the Secretary of War, they "conceive that such a termination of the war would be a sacrifice of the national dignity, and an absolute and clear triumph on the part of the Indians"—and "inconsistent with the plainest and commonest principles of justice." "The

treaty of 1823, at Camp Moultrie," they say, "stipulates in substance, that all runaway slaves which go into the Indian country, after the date of that treaty, shall be taken up by the Indians, and restored to their owners;" and they "respectfully suggest, that unless this stipulation is held to be binding on the Indians now and its performance rigidly exacted from them, as well as a restoration of such negroes, &c., as have been captured during the war, the owners of such negroes can entertain no reasonable hope of recovering them, familiar as they must have become since their residence among the Indians, with the many fastnesses and hiding places of the country, known only to the natives. Besides, they will be able successfully and permanently, or for a long time at least, to elude pursuit, unless they are taken and brought in, by those who made them acquainted with their present places of refuge and security."

The very modest claim then of these gentlemen was, that the United States, notwithstanding a fair opportunity to end the war, should go on expending millions more of the people's money, and the lives of brave soldiers, dragged from every part of the Union, until they should compel the Indians to turn negro-hunters, and bring in certain slaves claimed by seven individuals "temporarily in Charleston." Within two weeks after this protest, we find General Jesup writing—"I have some hopes of inducing both the Indians and Indian negroes to unite in bringing in the negroes taken from the citizens during the war." So it seems, that the interference of the slaveholders was not without its influence.

Meanwhile, we gather from the following order, that the intermeddling of the whites with the negroes among the Indians became more and more troublesome.

"TAMPA BAY, April 5th, 1837.

"Orders 79.—1. The Commanding General has reason to believe, that the interference of unprincipled white men with the negro property of the Seminole Indians, if not immediately checked, will prevent their emigration, and lead to a renewal of the war. Responsible as he is for the peace and security of the country, he will not permit such interference, under any pretence whatsoever; and he therefore orders that no white man, not in the service of the United States, be allowed to enter any part of the territory between the St. Johns river, and the Gulf of Mexico, South of Fort Drane."

"2. The inspector general will cause all merchant or transport vessels arriving in this harbor, to be immediately examined, and the names of all individuals on board to be registered. No one will be allowed to come on shore, except for the transacting of public business. Vessels from whom any individual shall be landed contrary to this order, or on board of which spirituous liquors shall be found, will be immediately sent off, and shall not, under any circumstances, be employed in the public service."

The same order directs the removal of the negroes, the property of citizens of the United States, from Tampa Bay to St. Marks. It is subscribed, "By order of Major General Jesup,

J. A. CHAMBERS,
Lieut. A. D. C. & A. A. Gen."

The fact that unprincipled white men have interfered with the negro property of the Indians, is here distinctly stated, and made the ground of a most decisive order, which never would have been issued, unless under a full conviction of threatening danger.

On its publication, however, the citizens of St. Augustine, and other inhabitants of East Florida, convened in public meeting, and appointed a committee of nine to protest against it. The committee acknowledge their obligations to the commanding general; but, "while they believe, that the accomplishment of a certain pacification must, as it ought, be an object of primary importance in these negotiations, they persuade themselves that the preservation of the negro property belonging to the inhabitants of this desolated country, must be seen by him to be an object of scarcely less moment!" They conceive, that by the testimony of the negro and Indian alone, "are the rights of the people of this territory in their large negro property, now in the possession of the Indians, to be judged of and determined." "Against such a course—a course so destructive of their rights and interests—the citizens of St. Augustine and others, in the above-mentioned public meeting, assembled for themselves, and on behalf of the inhabitants of East Florida generally, (notwithstanding the integrity of purpose by which, they freely concede the order in question has been prescribed,) do *most solemnly protest*." We shall see in the sequel whether General Jesup withstood this protest, any better than he did that of the seven gentlemen above-mentioned against his treaty of peace. That these last had not moved in vain, we shall now see.

Tampa Bay, April 8th, 1837, General Jesup writes to Lieut. Col. W. S. Harney—"I have made an arrangement with the chiefs to-day, to surrender the negroes of white men, particularly of those taken during the war. They will be delivered to you."

Tampa Bay, April 17th, S. Churchhill writes by instruction from the commanding officer, to John Mizelle, of Jacksonville, Florida, a claimant of negroes, and concludes his letter as follows—"The Indians have agreed to send all the slaves they have taken from white people during the war, to Fort Mellen and Volusia, and runners are now employed in the interior on that service."

Similar intelligence is communicated on the same day, by the same gentleman, from General Jesup, to two other claimants of negroes.

The General himself writes, under date, April 26th, 1837, to Lieut. Col. N. Brown—"I have made arrangements for the delivery of the negroes captured during the war by the Indians. They are to be delivered, if they can be taken without delaying the Indians in their movements, at the posts on the St. John."

"The Indians are not bound to surrender runaway negroes. Before they ceded the country, they were bound to do so; but it is not now their business. They must and shall give up those taken during the war; or at all events, they shall not take them out of the country; further, I shall not require them to interfere."

April 27th, he writes to the Hon. J. L. Smith, of St. Augustine—"I shall require the chiefs before they depart, to surrender all negroes taken during the war. Those who absconded previously to the war, shall not leave the country, though I have no right to require the Indians to surrender them."

It will be seen, that ground is taken by General Jesup in all these letters, that was not taken in the treaty. No stipulation whatsoever, as we have before remarked, was made, as to the surrender of runaways or captured slaves. As to the new arrangement alluded to, we have no other information, than is given in the extracts just quoted, by which it would seem that the arrangement was all on one side. "They," (the Indians) "MUST AND SHALL *give up those taken during the war; or at all events, they shall not take them out of the country.*" This does not sound, as if the wishes of the Indians had been consulted. And again—"I shall require the chiefs before they depart, to surrender all negroes taken during the war. Those who absconded previously to the war shall not leave the country." All this is in the tone of a *master*, not of one who is but an equal in a certain agreement with another. It is all easily understood. The hostages had been given up by the Seminoles, and it was now convenient to carry out the wishes of the slaveholders, without adhering to a very rigid construction of the treaty. It may be asked, what became of the slaves captured from the Seminoles? Was their surrender to their former masters also a condition in this new arrangement? If such were the fact, the correspondence would undoubtedly contain some allusion to it. But, not the most distant intimation of the kind is given. Nothing of the kind, we may be assured, was included in the arrangement. The whole transaction, in the estimation of every candid man, will be regarded as truce breaking. Further—General Jesup was fully aware that family alliances had been formed between many of the slaves, whom he was determined to prevent removing with the Seminoles, and their new masters; and he knew, for he has told us, how great is the influence of the negro over the Indian; and he ought to have known that the negroes would do all in their power to prevent the Indians from going so long as they were detained. In view of all this, he persisted in his ruinous policy, for the slaveholders had resolved that it should be so. Thousands more of precious lives, millions more of money were nothing, when weighed against the claims of a few avaricious men.

So much for General Jesup's subservience to local interests, at the expense of the common good and the honor of the government. Let us now see, what mischief the interference of private individuals was working.

April 18th, General Jesup, then at Tampa Bay, writes to Governor Call of Florida—

"If the citizens of the Territory be prudent, the war may be considered at an end; but, any attempt to interfere with Indian negroes, or to arrest any of the chiefs or warriors, either as criminals or debtors, would cause an immediate resort to hostilities. The negroes control their masters, and they have heard of the act of your legislative council. Thirty or more of the Indian negro men were at and near my camp on the Withlacoochie, late in March; but the arrival of two or three citizens of Florida, said to be in search of negroes, caused them to disperse, and I doubt whether they will come in again. At all events, the emigration will be delayed a month, I apprehend, in consequence of the alarm of the negroes."

Tampa Bay, April 27, 1837, the General in a letter already quoted, to the Hon. J. L. Smith, says—"I received yesterday your letter of the 18th instant, with a list of slaves which you claim. Ansel is the only one of the three who has been taken. I have him employed at one of the interior posts as an interpreter.

"The negroes have generally taken the alarm, and but few of them come in, and those who remain out, prevent the Indians from coming in. But for the premature attempt of some of the citizens of Florida to obtain possession of their slaves, the majority of those taken by the Indians during the war, as well as those who had absconded previous to it, would have been secured before this time. More than thirty of the

Indian negro men were in and near my camp, when some of the citizens who had lost negroes, came to demand them. The Indian negroes immediately disappeared, and have not since been heard of."

The protest of the committee of the public meeting of citizens in St. Augustine, against order, No. 79, will prepare us to understand the following. The order was issued April 5th, and the meeting was called immediately on its promulgation.

May 1st, the commanding general writes to Major W. L. McClintock—

"You will consider the order No. 79 so modified, that citizens will be permitted to proceed South, as far as the Withlacoochie, and the Volusia road, for the purpose of collecting their cattle and horses; and all who have farms South of Fort Drane, will be allowed to visit them, or occupy them, and you will afford them every protection in your power."

May 2nd, he writes to Brigadier General W. K. Armistead—

"You will consider order No. 79 so far modified that citizens will be permitted to visit any of the posts on the St. Johns, and to traverse or remain in any part of the country, North of the Withlacoochie. There are large herds of cattle in that part of the country, which, no doubt, belong to the citizens; and, by allowing them to go into the country, they may secure, perhaps, a large portion of them. As it has been represented to me, that many persons are desirous of going to Fort Mellon for the purpose of purchasing cattle, all who desire to go for that purpose, may be allowed to go, and military protection, will, as far as possible, be afforded to them, in driving the cattle they may purchase to St. Augustine."

By looking back a little, it will be seen, that Mr. Churchill in his letter of April 17th states, that the Indians have agreed to send all the slaves taken from the white people during the war, to Fort Mellon and Volusia; and that General Jesup in his letter to Lieut. Col. N. Brown, directs that such slaves, if they can be taken without delaying the Indians in their movements, be delivered at the posts on the St. John. Now, the order No. 79 is so modified, as to permit citizens to go as far South as Withlacoochie and the *Volusia road*, to visit *any of the posts on the St. John*, and also *Fort Mellon*, the very places where negroes were to be congregated. And yet these citizens, all of them having lost some slaves, eager to recover them, or obtain others in their stead, and having protested against the order as injurious to their rights, are to be permitted to visit these posts, for the sake of finding or buying cattle! What had occurred to change the opinions of General Jesup, who three weeks before, had reason to believe, that the interference of unprincipled white men with the negro property of the Seminole Indians, if not immediately checked, would prevent their emigration and lead to a renewal of hostilities—and who, therefore, had prohibited all persons not in the service from going into this territory, under any pretence whatsoever? Had he a guaranty that there were no unprincipled men among these citizens, to whom the way was thrown open, by the modification of his order, to do all the mischief, that he was constantly apprehending from the interference of the whites?

Only a few days after this new arrangement, that is May 8th, we find him writing to the Secretary of War concerning a claim made to certain negroes by E. B. Gould, and concluding his letter with the following declaration—

"The Indians cannot be removed, if any interference with their negroes be permitted; and I will permit no interference, without positive orders from the government." And yet, as we have seen, he had just thrown down the barrier to this dreaded interference!

Further light we have on the general's determination to recover slaves alleged to belong to whites.

May 21st, he writes to General Armistead—

"I have received your letter of the 18th. The Indians should have delivered the negroes which they captured; but, as I informed you yesterday, I did not wish them to delay, for the purpose of hunting those who had not surrendered. The arrangements which you made with Coibargo are, however, sanctioned." Arrangements, we must infer, by which the Indians were employed to hunt the desired negroes. It will be remembered that Mr. Churchill in his letter, states that runners were employed "in the interior on that service."

May 25th, the General writes to Lieut. Col. W. S. Harney—

"If you should see Powell again, I wish you to tell him that I intend to send exploring and surveying parties, into every part of the country, during the summer; and that I shall send out, and take all the negroes who belong to white people, and he must not allow the Indians or Indian negroes to mix with them. Tell him I am sending to Cuba for bloodhounds to trail them, and I intend to hang every one of them who does not come in."

General Jesup is acting under the authority of the United States' government. He and the troops under his command are paid out of the United States' treasury. Behold him then! A United States' officer, converting United States' soldiers into *negro-catchers*, and resolving, at the expense of the government, to import Cuba blood-hounds, to hunt runaway slaves! And is it to such a man that the honor of our government should be committed? Is it to such an object, the money of the people of the North is to be devoted? Must the whole Union pour out its blood and treasure, and sacrifice its honor, in catching negroes for Florida squatters?

While General Jesup was thus exasperating

the Indians by this impolitic course, owners for negroes were continually urging their claims, and the General and his officers were kept pretty well employed in replying to them. In answer to one claimant, some interesting information is incidentally furnished.

"From the best information," (the General writes,) "I can obtain, many of the negroes who have run away from their masters, within a few years past, as well as the Indian negroes claimed by the white people, have gone to those islands," (the Bahamas.) "I think it probable all the negroes in the nation who can find the means of escape, will follow."

And now we ask, is it any wonder, that men thus imposed upon, harrassed, and dealt treacherously with by the whites, should once more fly to arms? Accordingly on the second of June, Micanopy and the rest of the hostages were abducted, and the torch of war was again lighted. This event is thus stated by the commanding general in a letter to Col. J. Gadsden, Charleston, S. C., dated June 14th.

"I have received your letter of the 28th ultimo. All is lost, and principally, I fear, by the influence of the negroes and of the people who were the subject of our correspondence. A party of armed warriors seized Micanopy, Jumper and Cloud, on the night of the 2nd inst., at their camp, about eight miles from this post, and hurried them off to the swamps of the interior."

The documentary evidence we have submitted, proves, that the cupidity of a few slaveholders is the reason why the war in Florida is protracted, and corroborates the position taken by Judge Jay, that this disgraceful contest had its origin in SLAVERY.

We cannot conclude, without offering one more proof on this point, the more valuable, as it is Southern testimony, furnished incidentally.

A company of Seminoles, with their negroes, having been carried to New Orleans, on their removal to the West, 67 of the latter were seized, on claims made by the heirs of Mr. Love. The Indians were highly exasperated, declaring that the government had brought them to New Orleans, only to rob them. The United States' attorney was ordered to do all he could for them, and the claims were fully proved to be fraudulent. The investigations of Captain John C. Casey, an officer who had served during all the war in Florida, and knows more, it is stated, "of the Indians and negroes than any other man," contributed greatly to this result. In a letter to Major Clark, dated July 11th, 1838, after having given a minute account of the negroes claimed as above, he says—

"I must now close this long account, with the hope that the claims of a few vagabond squatters, *whose race provoked the war by their iniquities*, will not be allowed any more consideration than they are entitled to."

[From the New York American.]

THE HARPER'S SCHOOL LIBRARY.

We had occasion some days ago to advert to a sort of irresponsible censorship exercised over this publication, so eminently important, and if honestly and conscientiously carried out—so widely influential.

We have now in the subjoined letter, from the son and biographer of *John Jay*, specifications, showing, that to propitiate the living, nay, more, to render placable the fell spirit of Slavery, the truth of history, and the beauty, purity, and unity of such a character as that of *John Jay*, is to be sacrificed.

Of the part taken in this immolation by Professor Renwick, we do not permit ourselves to speak. The indignant feelings of a son defending an honored father's name, forbid any interposition on our part.

We cannot, however, but express the hope that what looks as like misrepresentation of the opinions of Mr. Jay, may be put to the score of hasty and undesigned misapprehension.

At any rate, we shall feel bound to lay before our readers any explanation that Mr. Renwick may offer.

Renwick's Life of John Jay.

It will not, it is hoped, be thought obtrusive in the son and biographer of JOHN JAY, thus publicly to expose the gross injustice done to his character, in the memoir of his life recently published in the 137th volume of Harpers' District School Library. If it be important to make the youth of our country acquainted with his acts and opinions, it is equally important that those acts and opinions be truly and not falsely represented, and more especially in relation to a subject indissolubly connected with the rights of humanity, and the destinies of the Republic.

To those who are observant of passing events, it is well known that one of the modes adopted by the people of the South for securing the permanency of Slavery, is by appealing to the cupidity of Northern publishers, to restrain the American press from giving currency to any description of literature in the least degree adverse to human bondage. Various instances to this effect might be adduced, but the following are sufficient to explain the very peculiar character of Mr. Renwick's book.

In 1835, "Harper & Brothers" published the narrative of two English Clergymen who had visited us as a deputation to a portion of the American church. These intelligent travellers of course noticed, and with disapprobation, but in guarded and temperate language, "the peculiar institution" of our country. The publication of *such a* book in New York, was deemed an insult to the South, and a Carolina Journal took occasion to lecture the publishers upon their *true interests*, and it had shortly after the the satisfaction of parading in its columns the following from the "Brothers"

"To the Editor of the Columbian Telescope:

"Sir, We noticed in your paper of the 13th inst. (December, 1835.) some remarks upon a book published by us, (Read & Matheson's Narrative,) in which you give us a word of caution respecting the publication of books containing *offensive sentiments on the subject of slavery.*'

They then go on to declare that they had previously ascertained that Messrs. Read and Matheson "were highly esteemed as gentlemen and Christians," and, *therefore*, they had not examined their work, and aver, "We had no suspicion of it whatever. You have, no doubt, heard of Mr. Abdy's book which was represented to us *as ably written*, and likely to be profitable, but we were also told that Mr. Abdy was an abolitionist; and *we would have nothing to do with him.*"

The character of the journal to which this humble apology was offered, may be gathered from the following extract from its columns:—

"Let us declare, through the public journals of our country, that the question of Slavery is not, and shall not be, open to discussion—that the system is deeply rooted among us, and must remain *forever*—that the very moment any private individual attempts to lecture

as upon its evils and immorality, and the necessity of putting means in operation to secure us from them, *in the same moment his tongue shall be cut out, and cast upon the dung-hill.*"

But this gentleman was not the only confessor of our enterprising publishers. The very next year they reprinted an English novel, without knowing that in one of its chapters were some "offensive sentiments on the subject of Slavery." Again were they rebuked, and again did they confess and bewail their involuntary offence in a letter published in the Charleston Mercury.

"We were," say they, "entirely ignorant of the fact that the 'Woods and Fields, contained the objectionable matter referred to *in your letter* of the 2d inst, until after the work was published. By this time it must be pretty generally understood in your section, as well as elsewhere, that we uniformly decline publishing works calculated to interfere, *in any way* with Southern rights and Southern institutions. Our *interests*, not less than our opinions, would dictate this course, if there were no other less selfish considerations. Since the receipt of your letter, we have printed an edition of the 'Woods and Fields,' in which the offensive matter has been *omitted*."

But merely to *omit* offensive matter, would have been negative merit. Hence, it was thought expedient by the Messrs. Harpers, to publish a volume containing a formal vindication of Slavery from the Scriptures, and abounding with panegyrics on slaveholders, and vulgar abuse of Abolitionists.

These are the men who have established a vast manufactory of books for the special use of the Common School children of the United States—books from which, as we have seen, they are pledged to exclude whatever may interfere in any way, not only with Southern rights, but also with "Southern institutions." In this manufactory, Mr. James Renwick, Professor of Chemistry in Columbia College, is one of the operatives, and to him was assigned the task of fabricating a life of John Jay, of course, suitable for the Southern market."

Mr. Renwick having no material for his work, except such as were furnished in the biography of my father, written by me, and published in 1833 by the Harpers, before the South had acquired the control of their press, asked my assent, which he admits in his preface was "liberally granted." In giving this assent, I did not at the time recollect the use which would necessarily be made of it.

At page 140 of his memoir, Mr. R. thus expresses himself:

"We have adverted, on more than one occasion, to the exertions of Jay in the cause of Abolition. Enough has, perhaps, been said, to show the position he maintained in relation to this question. Yet so much excitement has recently prevailed on this subject, that his course, perhaps calls for a *full explanation*. While Jay, as has been stated, was favorable to, and instrumental in, obtaining a law for gradual emancipation in the State of New York, it is obvious that he was not prepared to go the lengths of the modern Abolitionists. He did not deny the abstract right of holding slaves, or stigmatise those who did, as offenders against the code of morals and religion; for he made use of the services of slaves, both received by inheritance, and obtained by purchase. With a sound view of the provisions of the Constitution, and of the rights of the States, his efforts at emancipation were limited to the State in which he lived; and his very position as an owner of slaves, and a sharer in the probable loss by abolition, rendered his efforts more disinterested. If he forbore to apply to the General Government for the exertion of authority which neither by grant nor by implication does it possess, he equally avoided any attempt at agitation in those States where the condition of society had not prepared them for the measure. His views, in fine, were those of a sound statesman and enlightened politician, not those of a *fanatic & disorganizer*."

Had John Jay been represented as an "Abolitionist," the Harpers of course would have had nothing to do with him; but if he can be made to justify "the abstract right of holding slaves"—to declare that the Federal Government is restrained from exerting *any* authority in relation to Slavery; and lastly, if he can be made to rebuke his son as a "fanatic and disorganizer" for being an abolitionist, the publishers will, in the language of the trade, have made *a good hit*, and the book will sell at the South. Mr. Renwick has a perfect right to sit in judgment on my father's conduct and opinions, but he has no right to misrepresent them.

His "*full explanation*" of my father's course is avowedly given, in consequence of the recent abolition excitement, and obviously for the purpose of contrasting his conduct and opinions with those of "modern abolitionists." And here let it be observed, that it has not been deemed expedient to suffer Mr. Jay to explain for himself. Not *one single word*, written by him on the subject of Slavery, is permitted to appear in the District School Library. That he "was not prepared to go the lengths of the modern abolitionists," is true only to a certain extent. At the time he was in active life, it was the almost universal opinion, in which he concurred, that a compulsory immediate emancipation was too hazardous to justify the experiment; he therefore advocated a compulsory *gradual* emancipation. Experience has since shown that Slavery may be immediately abolished without permanent injury to either party, and greatly to the eventual benefit of both master and slave. On the other points of the "full explanation," I will give my father the privilege denied him by Mr. R.—of speaking for himself: and I will give only so much of his language as is contained in the very book which Mr. R. has abridged.

He did not deny, we are told, "the abstract right of holding slaves." In a deed of manumission, drawn and signed by himself, he says: "Whereas the children of men are by nature equally free, and cannot, without injustice, be either reduced to, *or held in, Slavery*." During the Revolutionary war, he wrote—"Till America comes into this measure, (gradual emancipation,) her prayers to Heaven for liberty will be *impious*." He drafted and signed a petition to the Legislature of New York, beginning, "Your memorialists, deeply affected by the situation of those who, *free by the law of God*, are held in Slavery by the laws of this State."

But holding such opinions, how came he to "use the services of slaves received by inheritance," as Mr. R. says he did? This assertion I regard as a strange mistake. If he ever had in his possession for one moment a slave received by inheritance, I am ignorant of the fact.

But he made use "of the services of slaves obtained by *purchase*." It did not suit the purpose of the book to include in the "full explanation" Mr. Jay's *own* explanation of this part of his conduct, viz: "I purchase slaves, and *manumit* them at proper ages, when their faithful services shall have afforded me a reasonable retribution." In other words, he purchased their freedom, and for the money thus advanced, the servant repaid him in labor. In this arrangement, the servant, of course, joyfully acquiesced. In the whole course of his life Mr. Jay never *sold* a slave. Yet with the knowledge that he manumitted every slave he purchased, Mr. R. affects to praise his disinterestedness in promoting abolition at the hazard of losing his *property!*

We are next taught, that "with sound views of the constitution and the rights of the States, his efforts at emancipation were limited to the *State in which he lived*." Of course his example condemns every abolitionist in the free States.

At the formation of the New York Manumission Society, he was placed at its head, and retained the situation for five years. One of the first measures of the Society, was to print an edition of 2,000 copies of an Anti-Slavery tract, dedicated "to the honorable members of the Continental Congress," and the Society voted that "each member of Congress, and the Senate and Assembly of this State, be furnished with one of the pamphlets." To this tract was prefixed the constitution of the Society, with Mr. Jay's name as President, together with

a certified copy of the vote ordering its distribution. The preamble of the Constitution declared that "the benevolent Creator and Father of men, having given to them all an equal right to life, liberty, and property, no sovereign power on earth can justly deprive them of either, but in conformity to impartial government and laws, to which they have expressly or tacitly consented." The contents of the tract, and its distribution to members of Congress, form a very awkward commentary on the Professor's averment, that Mr. Jay limited his efforts at emancipation to the State in which he lived. The tract, combatting the alleged necessity for slaves at the South on account of the climate, says "There is not the least evidence of this, but much to the contrary. Whites are healthy and do the labor in the East Indies which blacks do in the West, in the same climate. The truth is, most of the whites which are born in the Southern States are not educated to labor, but the greater part of them in idleness and intemperance. The blacks are introduced to do the work, and it is thought a disgrace for a white person to get his living by labor. By these means, the whites in general are vicious, and all imbibe a haughty and tyrannical spirit by holding so many slaves." Alas for John Jay's sound views of the rights of the States! In this "incendiary publication" the Society presumed to admonish even the clergy of their duty. "Why should the Ministers of the Gospel hold their peace, and not testify against this great and public iniquity? (holding slaves.) They are commanded to lift up their voices, and shew the people their sins." Again: "A number of Churches in New England have purged themselves of this iniquity, and determined not to tolerate Slavery. If all the Churches in these United States would come into the same measure, and imitate the Friends called Quakers in this article, would they not act more like Christian Churches than they now do!"

So far from confining his efforts to the State in which he lived, Mr. Jay entered into correspondence with an Anti-Slavery Society in England, and another in France, and remarked in his letter to the former, "We will cheerfully co-operate with you in endeavoring to procure advocates for the same cause in other countries."

Before taking leave of the New York Society, it may be interesting to offer the following instances of the fanaticism of our forefathers. In 1786, the Society offered a gold medal "to the person who shall deliver the best oration at the next annual commencement of the College in New York (Professor Renwick's College,) exposing in the best manner the injustice and cruelty of the Slave-Trade, and the oppression and impolicy of holding negroes in Slavery." The next year a competitor for the prize appeared, and on motion of the Mayor of the city, a committee was appointed to wait on the abolition student for a copy of his oration. The committee consisted of the Mayor, Alexander Hamilton, and Melanchton Smith. A committee was also appointed (Mr. Jay being still president) to wait on the printers of newspapers to persuade them "to refrain from publishing advertisements for the sale of slaves, or for runaway slaves."

To return to Mr. Renwick. He assures us Mr. Jay "forebore to apply to the General Government for the exertion of authority, which neither by grant nor by implication does it possess." Small praise this, that Mr. Jay, who, it seems to us, was deemed competent for the office of Chief Justice of the United States, forebore to ask Congress to do what he must have known it had no right to do! And is this intended for eulogy? By no means: and it is only a sort of half concealed, irresponsible charge, that the son of John Jay, and those who act with him, are doing what his father forbore to do. There is as little truth as there is manliness in the insinuation.

If Mr. R. only wishes to be understood, that Congress has no power to abolish slavery in the States, the following extract from an Address by the officers of the American Anti-Slavery Society in 1835, will show him, that "modern Abolitionists" need no lectures on constitutional law from the Chemistry Professor in Columbia College. "We hold that Congress has no more right to abolish Slavery in the southern states, than in the French West India Islands. Of course, we desire no national legislation on the subject."

It is true the Abolitionists have applied to the General Government to exert its authority for three objects, viz:

1. The Abolition of Slavery in the National Territories;

2. The suppression of the Slave Trade between the States;

3. The exclusion in future, from the Union, of any new slave state.

Does Mr. R. mean to imply that neither by grant nor by implication, has Congress authority to effect these objects? If so, he differs from Daniel Webster, who, on such subjects, is at least of equal authority with the Professor. John Jay, also, in a letter which Mr. R. has read, says that slavery ought not to be permitted in any new State; and that the authority of Congress to prohibit the migration and importation of slaves in any of the States, does not appear to him to be even "questionable." Did Mr. R. mean to contradict these doctrines of Jay and Webster? If not, what did he mean?

Mr. Jay's views were those of an "enlightened politician." Indeed! And does the Professor mean to condemn those politicians who measure out political rights to our citizens according to the tincture of their skin? In his "full explanation" he of course avoids the most distant intimation of Mr. Jay's views in relation to the rights of colored people. The doctrine of modern Abolitionists, which more than any has exposed them to contumely and violence, is that black men have naturally, and ought by law to enjoy, the same rights as white men. Mr. R. knew but conceals the fact, that on this point Mr. Jay went the whole length of the Abolitionists of the present day. "I wish," said he, "to see all unjust and unnecessary discriminations every where abolished, and that the time may soon come when all our inhabitants of every color and denomination shall be free and equal partakers of our political liberty." In the preamble of the Constitution of the Society over which he presided, it is declared to be the duty of Christians to endeavor to enable the slaves "to share equally with us in our civil and religious liberty to which they are by nature as much entitled as ourselves." In accordance with these views the original constitution of New York, drafted by him, withheld no political rights on account of complexion. If then Mr. Jay was "an enlightened politician," where will Mr. R. find another holding the same views, unless in the ranks of "modern Abolitionists?"

It certainly borders on the ridiculous, for the Professor, after analyzing my Father's character, and submitting it to the various tests in his laboratory, gravely to announce to the world, as the result of his labors, the important discovery that John Jay was not a "fanatic and disorganizer!" But it should be recollected, that in the dialect of the region for which the book is specially intended, he who believes it sinful to reduce men, women and children, to beasts of burden, is a fanatic; and he who, by lawful means, would rescue them from their degradation, a disorganizer. Had he thought proper to tell the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, respecting my Father's course in relation to slavery, and had he then ventured to vindicate him from the charge of being a fanatic and disorganizer, we should soon have had a third letter from "Harper & Brothers" circulating in the Southern papers, protesting that before employing Mr. Renwick they had "ascertained that he was highly esteemed as a gentleman;" that they "had no suspicion of him whatever," and that since they had been informed of the character of the work, they had printed an edition of the life of John Jay, "in which the offensive matter has been omitted."

WILLIAM JAY.

FACTS FOR THE PEOPLE.

No. VIII.

THE FINANCIAL POWER OF SLAVERY

The substance of some remarks made at different times and places during a late tour in Ohio.

I regret that this sketch has been so long delayed, and is finally prepared under so many embarrassments -because I am sure that the thoughts thus inadequately set forth are eminently deserving the serious consideration of the American people at this time.

—

I come now to consider slavery as the chief source of the commercial and financial evils under which the country is groaning. I will not now dwell on the financial evils of a fluctuating policy, such as slavery is continually demanding. It must be evident to the slightest observation, that *all* the great changes of policy, which have successively involved in disaster each and every northern interest, have been introduced by the dictation of the Slave power.—And it is equally obvious that so long as slavery reigns by fomenting the strife of party at the North, *we never shall have a settled policy.* The slave holders are, at this moment, actually creating a new ferment at the North with regard to the tariff, that they may hold the balance of power and keep the North in subjection, and above all, prevent our uniting by constitutional means to put down the grand evil that eats out our vitals.

Slavery absorbs the available capital of the North, and thus creates periodical revulsions, each one more severe than the last.

We are all aware that it is "hard times" at present. Not an individual in the community who has not personal knowledge on this point.—What is 'hard times?' Why money is scarce. All agree in that. When money is scarce, and produce brings a low price, and a man cannot borrow of his neighbour to meet a pressing emergency, and every one feels embarrassed, and crippled, and poor, then it is "hard times." Well, it is "hard times" now, and money is scarce. What has become of the money? It is well known that we have had a longer career of industry and enterprise and peace. Our people have earned a vast amount of money in the last 15 years. And by the influence of advancing religion and morals, and the glorious temperance reformation, we were saving a great deal. The temperance society tended powerfully to the accumulation of wealth, by lessening the enormous waste of property which used to be occasioned by strong drink. We were really growing rich. The apparent prosperity of the years 1829–36, was very much of it real. It was a reliance on this cause, more than any thing else, that deceived my mind with regard to the real state of the country. I overlooked the drain, which was silently and rapidly carrying these accumulations of industry and economy where they could never be recovered. Had the free States been subject to no losses but those of their own extravagance, (great and foolish and criminal as that was,) none, nor all of the alleged causes of our present depression could have produced this deep and protracted embarrassment.

Our Available capital has been sunk.

There is a nice question in political economy which I will not undertake to settle, for I do not profess to be learned in these matters. What becomes of lost capital? has puzzled wiser brains than mine. Some say it is sunk and annihilated; others, that it only has passed into other hands, where it may accumulate, or lie in a state of congestion for a while, but a change of times will set it all a going again without the annihilation of any portion. Let those decide who understand the course and operation of Asiastic cholera. Whether annihilated or not, it is lost to us, and, as I shall show, will never come back to those who have honestly earned it, but have now been deprived of it through the effect of slavery.

The Boston Daily Advertiser, the leading commercial paper of that city, had an article on the 6th of July last, from an able writer, who furnished a series of essays on the finances and currency of the country. The writer states that there has been a hundred millions of dollars of banking capital sunk in this country since the year 1836, estimating what remains at current prices; but he considers the actual loss much greater, because the stocks are in fact worth much less than they are now quoted. Then there is a loss to the country of fifteen or twenty millions in irredeemable bank notes. Then there are a hundred and fifty millions loaned to stockholders and directors, and spent in extravagance and speculation. Is it any wonder that we have hard times?

This vast amount of Capital is lost at the South.

I am not undertaking to give full and detailed information on this subject. Much of it is difficult to be come at, and much of it lies out of my ordinary track of inquiry. But ask any man of business in our cities where his capital is gone, and where his hopelessly irrecoverable debts are, and he will point to the South.—Go among the merchants or the manufacturers, and you will find one complaining of his ten thousand, and another of his hundred thousand, and another of his two or five hundred thousand dollars of southern debts. He would get along very well now, if it were not for that southern debt. And behind every one of these stands another class, who have sold goods, or lent money, or given their endorsement to others that have trusted their all to the South, and now cannot pay. And behind these another class, and another, and another, until there is hardly a remote hamlet in the free States that has not been directly or indirectly drained of its available capital by the southern debt. The writer above referred to, says that the Banks of Philadelphia have twenty-five millions of dollars of 'failed notes.' Probably that is within the truth. But nearly every dollar of this is, directly or indirectly, southern debt. Look at Newark. I was told, three years ago, that the people of Newark had three millions of dollars at one time, of protested southern paper. I do not know that it is so, but I know that the place has been most dreadfully impoverished, and all in consequences of southern trade—that trade which they were so eager to preserve that they would trample on law and order to put down the discussion of slavery. Look at Philadelphia, her banks suspended, and her business, for a long time thrown into desolation, and all through the "Southern debt." What keeps down the price of the United States Bank stock? Its southern debt. What makes it uncertain whether that bank will resume payment in January—or break?* Its immense southern debt—debt, of whose amount and condition the public have little means of judging.

What Carried the Capital to be sunk at the South?

It is a great help towards believing a novel truth, when we are able to see clearly that there are causes in existence, sufficient to account for the existence of the alleged fact. Let us inquire whether there are causes enough to afford a rational and satisfactory explanation of this doctrine. I do not intend to show all the ways by which the available capital of the free States has been

*The bank has at last broken down under its Southern debt.

FACTS FOR THE PEOPLE.

No. VIII.

THE FINANCIAL POWER OF SLAVERY

The substance of some remarks made at different times and places during a late tour in Ohio.

I regret that this sketch has been so long delayed, and is finally prepared under so many embarrassments -because I am sure that the thoughts thus inadequately set forth are eminently deserving the serious consideration of the American people at this time.

—

I come now to consider slavery as the chief source of the commercial and financial evils under which the country is groaning. I will not now dwell on the financial evils of a fluctuating policy, such as slavery is continually demanding. It must be evident to the slightest observation, that *all* the great changes of policy, which have successively involved in disaster each and every northern interest, have been introduced by the dictation of the Slave power.—And it is equally obvious that so long as slavery reigns by fomenting the strife of party at the North, *we never shall have a settled policy.* The slave holders are, at this moment, actually creating a new ferment at the North with regard to the tariff, that they may hold the balance of power and keep the North in subjection, and above all, prevent our uniting by constitutional means to put down the grand evil that eats out our vitals.

Slavery absorbs the available capital of the North, and thus creates periodical revulsions, each one more severe than the last.

We are all aware that it is "hard times" at present. Not an individual in the community who has not personal knowledge on this point.—What is 'hard times?' Why money is scarce. All agree in that. When money is scarce, and produce brings a low price, and a man cannot borrow of his neighbour to meet a pressing emergency, and every one feels embarrassed, and crippled, and poor, then it is "hard times." Well, it is "hard times" now, and money is scarce. What has become of the money? It is well known that we have had a longer career of industry and enterprise and peace. 'Our people have earned a vast amount of money in the last 15 years. And by the influence of advancing religion and morals, and the glorious temperance reformation, we were saving a great deal. The temperance society tended powerfully to the accumulation of wealth, by lessening the enormous waste of property which used to be occasioned by strong drink. We were really growing rich. The apparent prosperity of the years 1829-36, was very much of it real. It was a reliance on this cause, more than any thing else, that deceived my mind with regard to the real state of the country. I overlooked the drain, which was silently and rapidly carrying these accumulations of industry and economy where they could never be recovered. Had the free States been subject to no losses but those of their own extravagance, (great and foolish and criminal as that was,) none, nor all of the alleged causes of our present depression could have produced this deep and protracted embarrassment.

Our Available capital has been sunk.

There is a nice question in political economy which I will not undertake to settle, for I do not profess to be learned in these matters. What becomes of lost capital? has puzzled wiser brains than mine. Some say it is sunk and annihilated; others, that it only has passed into other hands, where it may accumulate, or lie in a state of congestion for a while, but a change of times will set it all a going again without the annihilation of any portion. Let those decide who understand the course and operation of Asiastic cholera. Whether annihilated or not, it is lost to us, and, as I shall show, will never come back to those who have honestly earned it, but have now been deprived of it through the effect of slavery.

The Boston Daily Advertiser, the leading commercial paper of that city, had an article on the 6th of July last, from an able writer, who furnished a series of essays on the finances and currency of the country. The writer states that there has been a hundred millions of dollars of banking capital sunk in this country since the year 1836, estimating what remains at current prices; but he considers the actual loss much greater, because the stocks are in fact worth much less than they are now quoted. Then there is a loss to the country of fifteen or twenty millions in irredeemable bank notes. Then there are a hundred and fifty millions loaned to stockholders and directors, and spent in extravagance and speculation. Is it any wonder that we have had times?

This vast amount of Capital is lost at the South.

I am not undertaking to give full and detailed information on this subject. Much of it is difficult to be come at, and much of it lies out of my ordinary track of inquiry. But ask any man of business in our cities where his capital is gone, and where his hopelessly irrecoverable debts are, and he will point to the South.—Go among the merchants or the manufacturers, and you will find one complaining of his ten thousand, and another of his hundred thousand, and another of his two or five hundred thousand dollars of southern debts. He would get along very well now, if it were not for that southern debt. And behind every one of these stands another class, who have sold goods, or lent money, or given their endorsement to others that have trusted their all to the South, and now cannot pay. And behind these another class, and another, and another, until there is hardly a remote hamlet in the free States that has not been directly or indirectly drained of its available capital by the southern debt. The writer above referred to, says that the Banks of Philadelphia have twenty-five millions of dollars of failed notes. Probably that is within the truth. But nearly every dollar of this is, directly or indirectly, southern debt. Look at Newark. I was told, three years ago, that the people of Newark had three millions of dollars at one time, of protested southern paper. I do not know that it is so, but I know that the place has been most dreadfully impoverished, and all in consequences of southern trade—that trade which they were so eager to preserve that they would trample on law and order to put down the discussion of slavery. Look at Philadelphia, her banks suspended, and her business, for a long time thrown into desolation, and all through the "southern debt." What keeps down the price of the United States Bank stock? Its southern debt. What makes it uncertain whether that bank will resume payment in January—or break?* Its immense southern debt—debt, of whose amount and condition the public have little means of judging.

What Carried the Capital to be sunk at the South?

It is a great help towards believing a novel truth, when we are able to see clearly that there are causes in existence, sufficient to account for the existence of the alleged fact. Let us inquire whether there are causes enough to afford a rational and satisfactory explanation of this doctrine. I do not intend to show all the ways by which the available capital of the free States has been

*The bank has at last broken down under its Southern debt.

sunk in the slave States. But if I can show that two or three of the prominent circumstances in the business of the country naturally led to such a result, and that there were no adequate counteracting causes, I shall sufficiently establish my position.

1. The capital of the North as naturally flows to the South as water runs down hill—i. e. to fill up a vacuum below it. Eighty years ago, a great statesman, in the British Parliament, laid it down as an axiom in political economy, that planters are always in debt. The system of society in a slave holding community is such as to lead to the contraction of debt, which the system itself does not furnish the means of paying, and which must, therefore, be wiped off by periodical bankruptcies. The ill economy of slave labor is seen in a thousand particulars, the wastefulness of the slaves is exceeded only by the extravagance of the masters, while the social *rank* (!) which is generally conceded to him who exercises power over his fellow-men, is a passport to credit. So long as credit lasts and times are prosperous, the slave holder is a very good paymaster, but the general indebtedness is all the while increasing until a commercial crisis comes, to disclose the true state of things. There is, then, this difference between a slave holding and a free community. When a pressure comes upon a free people, they immediately begin to curtail their expenses and increase their products, they work harder and save more, wear the old coat, sell all they can, and buy nothing they can do without,—because they intend to pay their debts. The slave holders, on the contrary, always drive their producers, (the slaves,) to the utmost, and the time of high prices is especially the time of high pressure, and this makes the poor slave pray that cotton may be cheap. Consequently, when hard times come, the slave holder has no way to increase his products, and there is no way he can curtail the weekly peck of corn, and the yearly shirt and overalls which he expends upon his slaves. And as to his own expenses, it is of more importance to him to maintain his standing as a gentleman planter, that it is to pay the rascally shopkeepers, and, therefore, when a pressure comes, we do not see in the slave holding States any such calculations and efforts to pay the old debt, as are found in the free States. The sense of obligation to pay debts is essentially different between people who always live on the earnings of the poor; and those who have nothing but what they have earned by their own industry. The effect is, that in our commercial revulsions, there is a general calculation that the bulk of indebtedness from the free States will be paid, and that the bulk of the slave debt will be lost. The free expect to pay their debts, if it take years of toil and self-denial; the slave holder likes to pay debts if it is convenient, but to work and save to pay an old debt enters not into his thoughts. And since slavery does not, in fact, support itself as it goes along, it is of course, impossible that it should furnish the means of paying the old debt. Here is a history of any and every one of our commercial relations, so far as slavery is concerned.

2. Now, look at the next commercial period. The industry and economy produced by hard times among a free and moral people, naturally leads to an accumulation of capital, and, then, to an extension of credit. The productive power of free industry aided by orderly habits and light taxes has never yet been properly appreciated. And credit is as natural a concomitant of such a state of society as vegetation is of summer heat. Were such a community left to its own resources, its prosperity would be constant, and without any assignable limits. But, here we again find ourselves subject to the exhausting operations of slavery. "Our glorious union" makes the slave holder a fellow countryman with us, and slavery one of the "institutions of the country." As soon therefore, as capital begins to abound again, and credit grows easy, the slave holding States naturally avail themselves of it to contract new debts, and again absorb the capital, and crush the credit of the free, and then produce another revulsion, leaving another batch of irrecoverable debts, and another set of bankrupt creditors and another general collapse of the free States through the exhaustion of their capital. Who does not see that the repetition of this periodical process is as natural as the tides, and as well explained as that water runs down hill!

The Union of the free and slave States under our government—having one constitution, one country and one destiny," naturally gives to slavery the control of our financial interests, as water seeks its level. The impoverishing tendency of slavery makes it a drain upon the capital of the North, let the financial policy of the general government be what it may. But,

3. This tendency of northern capital to the South is greatly increased by the existence of a "credit system." Observe the distinction between credit and a credit system. Credit is the natural growth of confidence, and when left to itself, is given to a man chiefly on the ground of his capital, talents for business, integrity, and facilities for doing business to advantage. Diminish or increase either of these, and you lessen or extend his credit in the same proportion.

A credit system, on the other hand, is an artificial policy of the government; either through a bank or some other device, which shall either pledge the public revenues or give a special sanction of the government, so as to increase the general amount of credit beyond its natural and unassisted growth. I am not now called to consider the question in the abstract, whether the credit system is ever a wise policy to be adopted by a free government. It may be that there are inherent evils in that system, which will always make it cost more than it comes to, in the long run. Or it may be, that a system which, as Mr. Webster says, would give "a savor of nationality" to credit, might be permanently beneficial, in a country whose parts were governed by homogeneous institutions, and enriched throughout by the same kind of labor. Be that as it may, it is easy to show, that in a mixed country, part depending on free labor and part on slave labor, a credit system answers the mere purpose of a sluice-way, to hasten the transfer of northern capital to fill up the emptiness of the South. The greater the general amount of credit in the community, the more easily and the more extensively will the slave sections obtain credit. And as it is a settled axiom that planters will always go in debt as far as they can, we easily see that the facilities of a credit system will be used to the utmost by them. And as they are not restricted, like the free, debt-paying States, by an old debt, nor governed at all by those strict ideas of mercantile honor that prevail among business men, the deductions of reason coincide with the results of experience, in regard to the disastrous effects that must always follow from a credit system, so long as slavery remains. And when we add to this consideration, the fickleness of the Slave Power, and see how often it has changed the national policy, we can compare the attempt to build up a credit system in this country to nothing so much as a co-partnership between two, beer-shops, one of which makes its own liquor and drinks none, and the other buys on credit and drinks beside. At length they grow tired of carrying the beer in buckets, and it is agreed to have a conducting pipe from one vat to the other, that shall keep them always on a level. This answers for a time, until, just about the time that the industrious man's stock is about to fail, the other gets drunk and knocks the bottom out. Seven times, at least, since the Federal Constitution was established, slavery has knocked the bottom out. The conclusion is, that a credit system must ever prove injurious to the country as long as slavery continues. Unite with us and put an end to slavery; and we shall be prepared to talk about a credit system, and then, if the wisdom of a united people shall approve of it, we can have it permanent. But till then, it can neither be good nor lasting.

4. The equalizing of the exchanges has furnished an illustration of the necessary effects of an artificial system of financial relations between the free and slave states. The late United States Bank had a capital of 35 millions of dollars; a very small proportion being the property of slave-holders. It also enjoyed the use of

the national revenues as deposites, and received and disbursed all moneys of the United States. It had, moreover, branches in most of the principal commercial towns. With all these facilities, and a credit greatly enhanced by the financial reputation of its president, Mr. Biddle undertook to equalize the exchanges between the different sections of the country. Exchange is the price paid for the transfer of money from one place to another.—It is a service rendered, and has a proper measure of price, as much as carrying wheat to market has. The principal elements which enter into the calculation of the proper price of exchange are the distance and difficulty of transportation, the relation of supply and demand, and the risk arising among the parties drawing and drawn upon. Exchange, if left to itself, would ordinarily make some special allowance for this last consideration in the case of a slave holding community, because all experience shows that there is a much greater risk in doing business with slave holders. But the Bank, in equalizing exchanges, entirely disregarded this consideration, which is a part of the real expenses of the business, as much as the canal tolls are a part of the expenses of forwarding wheat. It follows, that the Bank must either make up this item out of the community, by its extra profits on some other branch of business, or it must make up the deficit out of its capital. In which way the Bank has, in fact, made it, whether out of its capital or its other profits, the stock-holders will probably know—*when they get their capital back!*

The effect of the credit system in producing the level between the two pools more speedily than could be done through the natural channels, is one of the most instructive subjects of study for our financiers and political economists. One pool is fed by the perennial spring of free labor; the other is trying to fill by the slow and reluctant percolation, through its sands, of slave labor enforced by the lash, but the waste by evaporation and the daily consumption is greater than the flow at the fountain. Our Union as one country leads to a transfer of waters to produce a level, through the natural channels of trade, but the credit system cuts a wider and deeper sluice and hastens the result; and then slavery knocks the bottom out, and the whole is lost.

5. One effect of this false advantage which the credit system and equalizing exchanges give to the slaveholders, is that the North is not only drained of its own circulating capital—such as is naturally put at the hazard of trade, but is deprived of a large portion of its fixed capital, and even involved in a most burdensome foreign debt, for resources which have been borrowed abroad to meet the deficiences, occasioned by the irrecoverable Southern debt. So that a considerable time must elapse, before we begin to accumulate fresh capital from our own earnings, while we work hard and live close to pay the foreign debt in which slavery has involved us. Had the free states been caught by the late revulsion, subject to no difficulties but those resulting from their own speculation and extravagance, foolish and criminal as these were, we should ere this have had all our affairs settled, and business again in prosperous motion. It is the Southern Debt which hangs like a mill-stone upon our banks and our individual merchants and manufacturers, and no man can as yet foresee the end.

6. The equalizing of exchange is doubtless one of the principal causes of the delusion under which our men of business have labored in regard to the stability and real value of Southern trade. Men of business found that they could get their paper cashed, or collect, receive and transmit funds, at the South, in Alabama or Mississippi, at as low a rate as in Maine or Ohio; and as such men are little accustomed to look deeply into the causes of things, it is not strange that they should conclude that a southern trade should be relied on, for the long run, as being as stable and secure as trade with northern customers. The great "regulator" assumed it to be so, and why should they not follow? But a southern trade, so long as it remains good, is always a great deal more profitable than the northern trade, because slaveholders are so liberal, they never stand about prices; they never haggle for the half cent; they have a great many other things to attend to when they come to the North, besides chaffering for prices like the mere yankee; they must go to the theatres, and visit the Falls and the Springs, attend the races, &c., and so they tell the jobber to make up a good bill to such an amount, at his discretion, for which the southerner used to give his note at nine or twelve months, and the United States' Bank would cash it for a small per centage. This was such a delightful way to do business, that at one time it was almost impossible for a country trader from the North, to get any body to look at him. But the day of reckoning came, the northern notes at four and six months, are generally paid to the uttermost farthing, although with some delay, while the southern debt hangs between the bank and the merchants, a dead-weight that will probably sink them both.

7. Should it be objected, that the policy of the present administration, which has been aimed at the subversion of the credit system, has been taken up by men peculiarly subservient to the dictation of the slaveholders, I admit the fact. There cannot be a doubt that the anti-credit policy has been adopted at southern dictation, for the benefit of slavery. Senator Walker, of Mississippi, has laboriously demonstrated the advantage which the planters would realize by reducing the price of northern labor, so that they could buy cheap, while they thought the price of cotton would keep up, because the mart was on the other side of the Atlantic. But, fortunately, sin is always unlucky, and just as this notable scheme was on the point of consummation, the price of cotton went down too, and fell lower, in proportion, than the price of labor, so that, instead of controlling the trade of the world, as they boasted they should, they are broken down, helpless, and obliged to beg a market at any rate. And, now, we see the whole South turning around, with one consent, for Harrison and the credit system. The slaveholders find that they cannot get along but as they can obtain credit, and so they are in favor of some new policy of "getting-in-debt made easy."

But if, contrary to all present appearances, the Whigs should fail of obtaining power, there can be no doubt that the slaveholders will contrive some other way to gain an advantage. They will make the independent treasury serve their turn; and why should they not? Let it be remembered, that if the national treasuries are placed in banks, slavery governs the banks; and if they are placed in government chests, *slavery keeps the key!* As a most enlightened and honest statesman once said, "Why should we dispute about the best way to prevent the union of purse and sword in the hands of the President, while *slavery grasps both purse and sword and the president too?*"

8. The great drain of northern capital to the South, to supply the ordinary defalcations of slavery, has been enhanced by the demands of the Domestic Slave Trade.

The extent of this trade in human souls cannot be fully ascertained until Congress shall prepare to exercise its constitutional powers by instituting a legal inquiry and requiring a return. Some idea of the whole may be formed, however, from a statement made by a man of business purposes, in the U. States Gazette, a leading commercial paper of Philadelphia, Feb. 1, 1840. The writer declares that upwards of forty thousand slaves were imported from the North into the single State of Mississippi, during the year 1836 alone; that in three years the slaves of that State increased 100,000, and that the debt incurred by the planters in those three years for slaves alone was ninety millions of dollars, the greater part secured by mortgage on the plantations and negroes. This trade was carried on by the aid of northern capital. Northern banks and brokers were involved, the U. States Bank was involved, numerous banks were started in the South-west on northern capital, the States themselves contracted loans to a vast amount to aid these banks, the dividends were astonishingly large, every body wanted stock in the Vicksburg, Grand Gulf, Brandon and other S. W. Banks, never was trade so vast and so profitable until the bubble burst, and all that capital is gone, sunk

irrecoverable. The South has nothing to show for it.—Whether the State stocks will ever be paid, will be known in a few years. The bank stock is gone.

9. If any person should still be incredulous as to the fact that slavery is the chief cause of our present commercial embarrassment, let him look at this domestic slave-trade in another light, and he will see that its demands are enormous, while its results present nothing but loss. Compare, for instance, two States in which there was a large section of country thrown open to settlement about the same time, by the removal of the Indians and other causes—Illinois and Mississippi. Each of these States received an accession to its laboring population, in the course of three or four years prior to 1837, of about 100,000 souls—all devoted to agriculture. The hundred thousand people that removed from the old States of the North to till the fat and virgin soil of Illinois, cost for removal not exceeding one hundred dollars on an average. And even this was paid, not by Illinois, but out of their own former earnings. I will leave out of view the circumstance that very many of them carried considerable sums of money to the State, and the other fact, that by the general understanding, one of these laborers is actually worth for productive industry, two such as are taken to the South.

Look now at Mississippi. Her hundred thousand laborers were brought from the slave-breeding States, at a cost of a *thousand dollars* a piece, or a total of one hundred millions of dollars. Now observe, that for this expenditure, the State of Mississippi has nothing to show but a laboring population of a hundred thousand persons. The individuals who sold these persons as property may call themselves the richer. That question I will not now argue. But it is plain on the face of it, that the addition to the wealth-producing power of the State is nothing but the strength of these laborers—the very same thing that Illinois got for nothing, with money in pocket to boot.—Now, do you not see, that for any State to expend a hundred millions of dollars merely to remove her laborers to the soil must be ruinous? Suppose the State of New York were to do it, with all her surplus capital, she would stagger and reel into bankruptcy. But Mississippi was a new State, and had no available capital, no roads, no canals, no cities filled with surplus wealth, she aised no provision for all this swelling population; she nanufactured no clothes, or tools, or carriages—all was o be bought and paid for, at the dearest rate, and all to be done with capital from abroad. And when it was all done, she had nothing to show for it, that was available in the world's market to raise the money from. The "union," the "compromises of the constitution," the delusive dreams of "southern trade," and the maddening war cry of "amalgamation," blinded the men of the North to furnish first all their own surplus capital, and, then, all they could borrow on either side of the ocean; but, all would not suffice to meet such a drain—to fill such a bottomless gulf, and *all broke together!*

10. To this result, the old United States Bank contributed all it could. The *pet-bank* system, and the encouragement given by Gen. Jackson and his friends to the formation of numerous State Banks, with vast capitals, (—all borrowed of course, at the North—) swelled the tide still wider and deeper. The distribution of the surplus revenue sent on another surge. In what way the sub-treasury system has helped, I do not exactly see, though from the eagerness of the S. W. representatives in its favor and the general sevility of the administration party, I have no doubt it was largely calculated upon for this purpose. Southern trade, politics, prejudice, every thing favored, and the wealth of the North was drained dry and poured, along these various channels, into the deep gulf which slavery has dug—and which has no bottom. It realized the prophetic description of those God-cursed fools who earned money to put into a bag with holes. That is where our northern capital went, and every remote hamlet in the free States is the poorer for it. It is gone—and gone forever. Mr. Van Buren's Independent Treasury, with nothing in it, cannot bring it back. General Harrison, with his Credit System, whatever it may be, cannot bring back that lost wealth, which slavery has squandered. Neither a northern man with southern principles, nor one with all sorts of principles, [on the subject of slavery] can restore our lost capital.—Free industry, enterprise and economy can go to work and produce it again, and they doubtless will do it. But so long as slavery governs the public policy, the slaveholders will again and again find means to transfer these accumulations of free labor to supply the constant deficiences of their own miserable system.

11. There are therefore two things essential to the deliverance of the free industry of the North from this intolerable burthen, of supporting slavery and enduring these perilous revulsions and bankruptcies. One is, to develope the true nature of slavery, as an element of our domestic fiscal economy, so that our merchants and manufacturers will understand the danger of carrying on a southern trade. But this the abolitionists have been doing for five years, and yet no one has heeded it. Notwithstanding the calamities of the last three years, the merchants and manufacturers of Philadelphia, of New York, of Newark, of Connecticut, of Rhode Island and Boston, are as blind and deaf on the subject of slavery, and as decidedly opposed to Anti-slavery meetings and agitations, as they were in the palmy days of 1835.—You cannot get them to take any Anti-slavery newspaper. The commercial and political papers, which are at once the organ and index of public sentiment in the trading classes, are as dumb as ever on the subject of Southern Trade. Which of them has developed, with any degree of fairness, the prosperity of trade which has grown out of Emancipation in the West Indies? How few have even published the facts in regard to the indebtedness of the State of Mississippi for slaves. And where is one that has traced the irretrievable bankruptcy of the South West to its true cause? The New Whig, in the hands of one of the most talented editors in the Union, ventured to make a few comments on the Mississippi article last winter, and in a month the editor was driven from his post, and the paper crushed, by the party said so often to be "most favorable to liberty," and certainly embracing a large share of the commercial and manufacturing interest.

As I was passing through Newark last winter, on my return from the annual meeting of the New Jersey A. S. Society, at Trenton, I called on my friend, the editor of the Newark Daily Advertiser, a gentleman deserving of the high respect he enjoys, as a man, a scholar and an editor—the organ of the trading interest of Newark. It happened that I had in my hand a resolution adopted by the Society, giving a brief summary of the Slave power according to the Federal Ratio, which I showed him, and also a copy of the Philadelphia article respecting the slave debt of Mississippi. He was greatly struck with them both, begged a copy of the resolution, which I transcribed at considerable personal inconvenience, on his promise to print it, and said the other was a subject of great importance to the people of Newark, as they had immense debts in Mississippi, and he should copy it without delay. Well, the piece on the Federal Ratio was never published, and the Mississippi article not until a week or two had elapsed in the Emancipator, thence copied into the Evangelist, and then published in the Commercial Advertiser and Journal of Commerce. This well illustrates the probability there is that more information respecting the commercial influences of slavery is likely to keep our commercial community from being again caught by the snare of southern trade.

One reason is, that both commerce and slavery are so intimately mixed up with politics, and hence the political influence tends to keep up the commercial delusion.—We shall never get the commercial community to read or to think on the subject, until the question can be made to present itself at the ballot box, and the opposers of slavery become the arbiters of destiny to political aspirants. This is one reason why we must have—

In the second place, a direct resistance to the political domination of the Slave Power. Mere complaining of its injustice will not answer. The North has always

complained of the slave representation which gives to the slavocracy this undue advantage:—and always yielded implicitly to the demands arising from it. Senator Davis, years ago, complained that slavery dictated all national appointments; and then Senator Davis yields his support to a party and a Presidential ticket, as thoroughly devoted to slavery as any that was ever presented to the people. Mr. John Quincy Adams complained that, in speaking on slavery, he had to address a Speaker who was a slaveholder; and next time he was called to vote for Speaker, voted for John Bell, and then for Hunter, both slaveholders.

Neither will bold denunciation serve the purpose.—There was a time when the slaveholders shrunk from the bold denunciations which were thrown out against their system, by Adams, Slade and others. But since they have learned that all these men will vote as slaveholders dictate, little do they care for denunciations.—"Let them harangue, if it will gratify them, and keep them in the ranks when they come to vote!"

The resistance must come to the *ballot box*. There is where we have to meet slavery, face to face. Nearly twenty years ago, an intelligent friend told me that the real secret of the southern movements in politics was to *keep off* the question of slavery. The slaveholders have succeeded so far—they will probably succeed once more, at the present election; but let us take the regular means to bring our principles to the ballot box this year, and they never will stave it off again. Before another term comes round, the whole nation will see that the great question is, and long has been, whether the Federal Government shall be administered for the good of the whole and the preservation of liberty, or for the good of a handful of slaveholders and the strengthening of slavery.

FREEMEN OF THE NORTH—WHAT IS YOUR DECREE?

SLAVE STATES AND FREE STATES.

The following abstract of the Agricultural Statistics of the United States is taken from the Philadelphia American. In a note the American remarks that the aggregate of the statistics of Michigan is not yet prepared. Fortunately, we are able to supply the deficiency, having in our possession the returns from that state. We have also taken the liberty of altering the arrangement of the states, so as to have all the free ones follow each other, for the sake of a more easy comparison with the slave states. The table is exceedingly interesting and important, and we advise the reader to lay it up for future use. Our own state figures largely, and is a noble illustration of what a rich soil, fine climate, and the untrammeled energies of *free labor* can accomplish.

STATES AND TERRITORIES.	Bushels of WHEAT.	Bushels of RYE.	Bushels of INDIAN CORN.	Bushels of OATS.	Bushels of BUCK-WHEAT.
Maine*	848,166	137,941	950,538	1,076,409	51,543
New Hampshire*	442,964	395,530	1,252,572	1,198,989	115,463
Vermont*	652,293	447,218	1,047,601	2,342,497	158,509
Massachusetts*	138,923½	641,956	1,809,395	1,899,530	87,010
Rhode Island	3,088	34,321	425,893	169,925	2,979
Connecticut	86,980	736,865	1,468,538	1,456,523	290,470
New York	11,853,507	2,984,013	10,195,142	20,728,738	2,244,338
New Jersey	774,023	1,636,376	4,311,381	3,096,516	866,970
Pennsylvania	13,629,736	6,293,447	13,696,619	18,063,477	1,971,728
Ohio (a)	16,314,260	801,943	33,354,162	13,993,624	691,535
Indiana	4,154,256	127,986	28,008,051	5,875,449	49,681
Illinois	2,740,619	95,965	22,116,657	4,585,507	63,950
Michigan§	1,899,283	31,090	2,215,787	3,717,177	89,184
Wisconsin Territory†					
Iowa Territory	154,737	3,787	1,326,241	216,385	6,217
(a) Shelby county since received	78,691	5,498	2,534,492	130,010	1,795
Delaware	215,165	35,560	2,909,261	937,005	11,290
Virginia	3,511,483	894,323	8,470,165	5,579,980	74,848
Maryland*	2,154,930	1,397,170	34,946,696	13,207,551	241,643
North Carolina†	10,066,390				
South Carolina	705,925	44,530	14,721,795	1,446,158	72
Georgia	1,723,956	60,851	17,323,797	1,390,048	269
Kentucky†					
Tennessee	4,547,273	1,705	42,467,349	3,779,116	6,187
Louisana	997,023	1,312	5,900,473	110,013	
Alabama	746,106	36,633	18,880,663	1,437,902	52
Mississipi	196,576	15,642	13,161,231	598,604	61
Missouri	946,077	63,195	15,591,432	1,937,523	16,947
Arkansas	112,200	5,925	3,831,149	167,452	89
Florida Territory§					
District of Columbia	12,147	5,081	39,385	15,751	272

*The returns of the States marked thus, (*) have been corrected. The statistics from the remainder

(Table Continued next page.)

AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS OF THE UNITED STATES.

COMPILED FROM THE RETURNS OF THE MARSHALS FOR TAKING THE SIXTH CENSUS.

Bushels of BARLEY.	Bushels of POTATOES.	HORSES and MULES.	NEAT CATTLE.	SHEEP.	SWINE.	Pounds of WOOL.	Value of POULTRY.	Tons of HAY.	Tons of HEMP and FLAX.	Pounds of gathered TOBACCO	Pounds of COTTON gathered	Pounds of SILK COCOONS
355,161	10,392,380	59,208	327,255	649,264	117,386	1,465,551	$123,171	691,058	38			
121,400	6,234,901	39,850	261,088	606,891	120,167	1,260,988	97,862	496,647	53,040	115		406
55,685	8,206,784	60,274	350,106	1,393,420	297,952	3,257,795	176,437	734,047	24¼	585		4,233
166,419	5,385,652	62,484	271,760	378,226	143,021	1,055,591	540,295	569,425	23,132	64,955		1,741
63,790	904,773	8,074	36,700	90,146	29,669	173,630	61,492	63,417	lb. 383	307		358
33,789	3,414,227	34,751	233,969	406,985	132,222	893,675	176,659	426,160	lb. 147,841	471,657		17,288
2,498,170	30,000,508	476,115	2,642,438	5,381,225	2,116,953	4,012,144	2,373,029⅝	3,160,916	763	6,567		2,103¼
12,601	2,074,118	69,769	219,548	218,555	259,051	396,573	412,487	326,496	33,710	1,922		1,966
178,100	8,626,923	338,565	1,146,418	3,396,431	1,450,531	3,076,783	1,033,172	1,199,963	170,760	350,861		278,939
207,590	5,600,566	407,404	1,186,204	1,964,957	2,084,268	3,650,970	730,720	1,024,803	252,520	6,023,309		4,316
25,778	1,548,190	243,767	614,489	673,952	1,580,051	1,202,209	393,228	191,158	97,657	1,821,406	180	370
64,455	1,956,887	195,186	604,693	377,963	1,394,280	600,366	330,968	156,442	50,326	415,706	199,989	1,171
101,045	2,051,339	26,141	175,120	89,934	342,920	169,129	76,318	111,095	24	1,107		159
729	234,063	10,801	37,449	15,354	104,891	23,028	17,101	17,953	313	12,676		
562	29,218	3,637	10,509	10,143	18,941	15,874	4,211	4,508				1
5,260	270,712	14,421	54,883	39,247	74,223	64,404	47,465	21,880	602½	272	347	1,442
3,594	1,058,919	93,954	240,432	261,909	421,520	500,499	219,159	110,836	34	18,916,012	5,673	2,290
14,620	2,873,470	243,173	1,008,313	1,280,736	1,916,230	2,672,044	752,467	288,740	92,123	14,157,841	10,767,451	3,188
3,967	2,697,713	130,826	573,840	232,664	888,513	289,202	590,594	20,008	35	51,518	148,907,880	2,210
13,345	1,184,386	134,748	755,060	254,947	1,288,314	363,340	473,158	9,264	1,787	164,551	134,322,755	3,208
4,758	2,373,034	327,526	777,390	748,459	2,795,630	1,029,526	581,531	30,512	45,053	26,542,448	128,250,308	1,163
	845,935	99,067	348,708	100,056	344,685	49,524	273,314	36,308		120,174	87,640,185	317
6,682	1,560,700	128,515	607,580	144,372	701,160	173,400	829,220	13,933	5	214,307	240,379,669	1,351
1,544	1,538,628	109,227	623,157	128,376	995,739	185,839	369,481	171	16	83,451	289,338,818	85
9,771	684,491	157,578	367,623	288,235	1,072,813	462,644	230,283	44,870	20,071	8,450,727	360,338	70
85	290,887	39,085	135,527	41,877	393,004	63,034	93,549	579	1,039	143,889	23,887,192	90
294	12,035	2,145	3,274	572	4,673	707	1,557	1,231		55,550		576

of the States and Territories are not yet examined. †The aggregate not yet made. ‡Statistics not yet received. §Aggregate not made. No return from Middle Florida. ‖Some of the

(Table Continued next page.)

Pounds of SUGAR. made.	Value of products of the DAIRY	Value of products of the ORCHARD	Gallons of WINE made.	Value of LUMBER produced.	Bls. PITCH, Turpentine, TAR, ROSIN.
238,230	$1,493,718	$148,249	2,236	$1,808,683	
1,097,398	1,585,955	220,056	94	401,358	
4,220,541	4,892,097	1,109,387	100	366,146	
579,227	2,273,219	389,177	1,905	476,845	
50	210,922	32,098	745	44,455	
51,764,	1,365,653	302,953	5,243	147,831	
10,093,991	10,497,032	1,732,357	14,700	3,788,173	2,924
56	1,315,670	562,863	9,416	297,856	2,200
1,555,977	2,271,420	554,657	19,182	566,607	1,807
6,909,257	1,701,602	461,191	161,844	300,242	430
3,720,186	751,441	90,324	3,495	213,471	
394,446	433,873	118,638	471	198,070	
1,190,738	218,951	16,658		455,727	3,628
				50,305	
41,450	23,609	50			
79,831	3,532			3,277	
	232,446	25,914	529	5,562	
36,266	466,558	114,339	7,622	230,985	
1,530,541	1,454,861	668,921	37,233	516,412	5,262
30,000	577,849	52,276	643	504,884	735
231,140	552,805	135,446	6,319	106,066	153
251,745	930,603	366,767	653	200,266	3,119
249,937,720	150,818	11,869	2,884	111,405	12,233
10,135	197,442	33,161	11,253	233,828	197
70	389,177	41,119	12	152,094	2,248
252,560	69,230	76,305	22	68,150	356
2,535	34,577	7,454		161,685	25
	75,566	3,507	25		

Marshals have returned pounds of Ginned Cotton, others in the seed.

TOTALS—A COMPARISON.

That the reader may see at a glance the comparative condition of the free and slave states, as it regards agricultural values, we have prepared the following tables. He will bear in mind, of course, that the returns from Kentucky and North Carolina are not given. When made they will considerably affect the proportions of the totals, so far as corn, hemp, tobacco, live, stock, lumber, pitch, tar, turpentine &c. are concerned.

	Free States.	Slave States.
	Bshls.	*Bshls.*
Wheat,	53,091,297½	22,794,853
Rye,	14,274,926	2,794,694
Corn,	123,031,959	177,038,486
Oats,	78,513,756	31,608,613
Buckwheat,	6,691,372	351,138
Barley,	3,885,274	63,920
Potatoes,	86,660,529	15,320,910
	Tons.	*Tons.*
Hay,	9,174,088	578,332
Hemp & Flax	662,601¼	160,765½
	Lb.	*Lb.*
Wool,	21,254,306	5,854,163
Slk. Cocoons,	313,151¼	15,990
Tobacco	9,171,173	68,900,740
Cotton,	200,169	1,063,860,616
Sugar,	30,173,142	251,282,712
Rice,		76,154,735
	No	*No.*
Horses, Mules	2,036,026	1,481,265
Neat Cattle	8,117,746	5,495,787
Sheep	15,653,446	3,521,450
Swine	10,192,303	10,896,509
	Value,	*Value.*
Poultry,	$6,547,150	$4,461,778
Products of the Dairy	29,046,700	5,131,932
Products of the Orchard	5,738,658	1,537,078
Lumber	9,119,046	2,291,337
	Bbls.	*Bbls.*
Pitch, turpentine &c.	10,989	24,328
	Gals.	*Gals.*
Wine.	219,431	67,195

A few remarks may be profitable.

1. There is rather more swine in the slave-states than free; considerably more corn, and pitch, turpentine &c.; a great deal more sugar and tobacco, and infinitely more cotton. With these exceptions, the agricultural products of the free, are far greater in amount than those of the slave-states.

2. If any one will take the trouble to calculate the values of the different products, he will find a large balance in favor of the non-slaveholding states, not less perhaps than $100,000,000. From this we may learn how much better it is to direct the labor of a country so as to bring out all its capabilities, than to concentrate it upon the culture of a few staples. Variety of production is necessary to wealth and independence.

3. Notwithstanding far less in amount and value is raised in the southern states, they occupy an area nearly one third larger than that of the free states, containing 170,524 square miles more than they; their soil is generally more fertile; their mineral wealth is greater, and their climate, some few localities excepted, is peculiarly genial. No reason can be assigned why they do not *produce* more, than that they are cursed by SLAVE-LABOR.

4. But only a part of the picture has been presented. While with nearly one third more territory, the slave-states *produce* far less than

the free, their *manufactures* and *commerce* are comparatively nothing. On the contrary, agricultural productions are but a part of the wealth of the free states—the *manufactures* and *commerce* of many of them yielding more value, than their agriculture! Taking all these elements together, no calculation, we presume, can reach the real wealth of these states.—But, when you have summed up the agricultural products of the slave-states, with some inconsiderable exceptions, you have told their riches. What an illustration have we here of the prodigious worth of free labor when compared with slave labor!

5. Let us notice a few particulars.

Much noise is made about the tobacco-interest. Grand conventions and spirited movements in promotion of it, we hear of frequently. It is even debated whether a cotton or tobacco minister shall be sent to a foreign court.—The article itself is a noisome weed, deleterious in its influences, answers in fact no good purpose, but wastes the money and juices of those who use it. But, *it is grown chiefly by the slaveholder*—it must therefore be treated with respect—tobacco-planting must be regarded as a grand interest, one of the regulators of national policy. Well—what is its value?—Compare it with the wheat-interest of the free states—and wheat, we know, is rather useful on the whole. The value of the wheat raised in the free states as you may calculate from the tables above, is eight times as great as that of all the tobacco of the slave-region, and twice as much as that of all the wheat and tobacco together of the slave-states; and yet who hears any thing said about the wheat-interest? What has Government done to promote it? Nothing.

The *sugar-planter*—who does not recognize the *sugar-planter*, as a little lord, somewhat of a grandee? He raises sugar by *slave-labor*—this is his patent to nobility—this, his title to the special favor of government. Suppose we talk of the *oats-sower*, or the *potatoe-raiser*?—titles, indeed, not particularly euphonic, but still distinguishing more productive classes than that of the *sugar-planter*. In the above table, the amount of sugar is set down at 252,-282,762 lbs., which, at 5½ cts., is worth $13,-135,627,20, a less value than that of the *oats* raised in the free states, which cannot be put at less than $15,000,000; or that of the potatoes, which may be estimated at $21,000,000!—And yet, to hear our southern friends talk, a stranger might be led to suppose that there was nothing in the country worth naming, but tobacco, sugar and cotton.

A word as to cotton. This, we know, is the great favorite staple with government, before the interests of which every thing must bend or break. Suppose we tell the planter, who points to the number of his cotton bales as a good and sufficient reason why he should give us our presidents and prescribe the policy of the Government, that the *horse and mule* interest at the North is as valuable as the cotton interest of the South—will he be offended? Has he never thought of the *hay*-interest? Senator Wickliffe's story about grass 6 inches high, and 200 lb. crops, to the contrary notwithstanding, it is a fact, that we raise hay enough in the free states to buy a good part of all the cotton produce of the South. The planter must pardon us for alluding to so plebeian an article as hay. For, if it does not regulate exchange between Great Britain and the United States, it has much to do in regulating the exchange between the animate and inanimate worlds; if it does not set machineries of human invention to work, it supplies machineries of a different order, from whose working, came butter, beef, and many other substantials too numerous to name. The statistics show in the slave-states, 578,332 tons of hay; in the free, 9,174,083. This at $7 a ton, low enough certainly, gives $64,218,616. The vaunted cotton of the whole South amounts to 1,-064,360,616 lbs, which at 9cts a lb. is worth $95,747,-455½, or only about as much as the hay and Dairy products of the free-states!

6. Another advantage in favor of the free states, or rather of free-labor. The variety of their crops prevents the wasting of their soil.—There is no reason to apprehend a diminution in the amount of their products generally, but much to calculate upon an augmentation. Increasing skill, science and economy, always attendant on free-labor, will bestow new capabilities on the soil. On the contrary, the forced production of a few staples in the South, is rapidly exhausting the richest soils, and there is nothing in slave-labor to prevent the waste, but much to favor it. Thus, while the growth of almost every product in the free states is steadily increasing, the reverse is true to a great extent of some of the staples of South.—More tobacco was exported before the revolution than is now. Its growth is stationary, or diminishing. The amount of rice raised has advanced very little during the last few years.—The growth of cotton has fallen off in Virginia, North Carolina and South Carolina, and appears stationary in Georgia and Alabama. The supply of sugar is increasing but has its limits. Twenty years more, and Lonisiana will find it necessary to replenish her soil.

7. Let us now ask the question—what should be thought of those Northern politicians, who, in view of the vast superiority of the free-states in population, knowledge, commerce, manufactures, and agricultural wealth, are forever truckling to the slaveholder, and sacrificing the honor and interests of their constituents to prop up a system which, left to itself, would fall from its inherent weakness? Can they, with the facts exhibited staring them in the face, listen with patience hereafter to the harangues of slaveholding demagogues about southern rights and southern interests, as if all Congress had to do was to legislate for cotton, sugar and tobacco! Let the rights of every portion of the Union be held sacred—let no interest of the nation be disregarded—give to the South all the protection it may justly claim—but, sternly reject its demands for more, its shameless assumptions of supremacy. Why should it control the policy of the general government and fill every department with creatures of its will? Henceforth, when you hear a clamor about the interests of the cotton, sugar, and tobacco-planters of the south, do remind them of the rights of the potato-raiser grass-grower, and wool-gatherer of the North.

FACTS FOR THE PEOPLE.

No. IX.

The following article is from the pen of JUDGE JAY, of New York, son of the celebrated Jay of the Revolution.

THE PROBABLE INFLUENCE OF THE ANTI-SLAVERY AGITATION ON THE PERMANENCY OF THE UNION.

Before we can predict what this influence will be, we must first enquire, what will probably be the direction and aim of the agitation? Every State possesses all the powers of independent sovereignty, except such as she has delegated to the Federal Government. All the powers not specified in the Constitution as delegated, are by that instrument reserved. Among the powers specified, that of abrogating the slave codes of the several States, is not included; on the contrary, the guarantee of the continuance of the African slave-trade for twenty years, and the provision for the arrest of the fugitive slaves, and the establishment of the federal ratio of representation, all to refer to and acknowledge the existence of slavery under State authority. If, therefore, the abolitionists, unmindful of their solemn and repeated disclaimers of all power in Congress to legislate or the abolition of slavery in the States, should, with unexampled perfidy, attempt to bring about such legislation—and if Congress, regardless of their oaths, should ever be guilty of the consummate folly and wickedness of passing a law emancipating the slaves held under State authority, the Union would most unquestionably be rent in twain. The South would indeed be craven could it submit to such profligate usurpation; it would be compelled to withdraw, not for the preservation of slavery alone, but for the protection of all its rights; and indeed the liberties of every State would be jeoparded under a government, which, spurning all constitutional restraints, should assume the omnipotence of a British Parliament. But it is scarcely worth while to anticipate the consequences of an act which can never be perpetrated so long as the people of the North retain an ordinary share of honesty and intelligence.

We have, under all the circumstances of the case, sufficient reasons for believing that the anti-slavery of the North, will carry its action to the very limits of the Constitution, but not beyond them. In despite of coalitions of parties, and the intrigues of politicians, liberty of speech and of the press will be extended by the very efforts made to arrest it. Let us suppose this discussion to be attended with its natural and probable result, the conversion of the great mass of the northern people to the principles and avowed objects of the abolitionists. Of course, those principles and objects will be embraced by their representatives in Congress.—In this case, we may expect that slavery will be abolished in the District of Columbia, and that it will be prohibited in territories hereafter to be formed on the West of the Mississippi. Thus far the constitutional power of Congress cannot be rationally questioned. Independent of the exclusive jurisdiction over the territories granted to Congress, we have the precedent of the ordinance of 1787, prohibiting slavery in the Northwest Territory, and the more recent prohibition of it in the Louisiana Territory north of 36½° of north latitude. The American slave trade is now, and has been for upwards of thirty years, prohibited in vessels under forty tons burden. We may therefore take it for granted, that the Senate's coasting trade will be legally abolished. Should the land traffic not be also destroyed, it would not be for want of disposition, or constitutional power in Congress, but on account of the extreme difficulty which would exist in preventing evasions of the law.

We have now the sum total of national legislation, which, on our present supposition, will result from the Anti-slavery action at the North. Yet we are positively assured that such legislation would cause a dissolution of the Union.—Now admitting the constitutional right, and the moral obligation of our national legislators, to pass the laws in question, it would be difficult to decide by what code of morals they could be excused from the discharge of their duty by the apprehension of consequences. If God governs the world, more is to be feared from rebellion, than from obedience to his will. If his wisdom and goodness are both infinite, his will is and must be an infallible standard of expediency. If it be folly to barter a single soul for the whole world, would it be wise to expose a nation to the wrath of Heaven, for a boon which we now hold, and would continue to hold at the pleasure of men who are daily threatening to deprive us of it?

But we have no fears that Congress will ever find the faithful discharge of their duty, conflicting with the welfare and preservation of the Union. How far selfish and influential individuals may succeed in raising up at the South a party for secession, it is impossible to predict; but it is not difficult to show that a separation founded on the legislation we have specified, would be most preposterous and disastrous, and therefore we may reasonably presume it will not occur.

Should the slave States secede, they would do so, we may suppose, for one or more of the following reasons, viz:

1. To protect their rights from invasion.
2. To guard and perpetuate the institution of slavery.
3. To increase their wealth and power.

The North is the strongest portion of the confederacy; and whenever, unmindful of the federal compact, it wickedly and forcibly usurps power to the prejudice of the South, secession is the only resource left to the latter for the protection of its rights. But a disregard to the wishes, does not necessarily imply a violation of the rights of the South. Not one of the measures we have contemplated as the probable result of the anti-slavery agitation, encroaches on the constitutional rights of the South; and therefore secession, however it might be professedly justified, would in fact be prompted by other motives than that of self-defence. But so long as the Federal Government confines its action against slavery within the limits of the Constitution, in what way would secession tend to guard and perpetuate the institution?

It is natural that the slaveholders should wish to destroy the influence of the abolitionists, and hence they have very unjustifiably expressed fears respecting them which they do not feel, and circulated calumnies which they do not believe. The following admissions reveal the true nature of the apprehensions entertained by the slaveholders.

Mr. Calhoun, alluding in the Senate to the opinions expressed by some of his southern colleagues, exclaimed: "Do they expect the abolitionists will resort to arms, and commence a crusade to liberate our slaves by force? Is this what they mean when they speak of the attempt to abolish slavery? If so, let me tell our friends of the South who differ from us, that the war which the abolitionists wage against us, is of a very different character, and far more effective—it is waged not against our lives, but our character."

Mr. Duff Green, the editor of the United States Telegraph, and the great champion of slavery, thus expressed himself in his paper.—"We are of those who believe the South has nothing to fear from a servile war. We do not believe that the abolitionists *intend*, nor could they if they would, excite the slaves to insurrection.—The danger of this is remote. We believe that we have most to fear from the organized action upon the consciences and fears of the slaveholders themselves, from the insinuation of their dangerous heresies into our schools, our pulpits, and our domestic circles. It is only by alarming the consciences of the weak and feeble, and diffusing among our people a sensibility on the question of slavery, that the abolitionists can accomplish their object." *

We would now respectfully submit to Mr. Calhoun's consideration, whether a secession would tend in any way to defend the characters of slaveholders from the war he contends is waged against them; or fortify their consciences against the "dangerous heresies" by which they are assailed?

The new nation would acquire from her separate independence, no new power to darken the understandings, or benumb the consciences of her citizens. The freedom of the press throughout the whole slave region is already extinguished.* Not one single newspaper, from Maryland to Florida, dares to raise its voice in favor of immediate emancipation; and a southern publication, for expressing views unfavorable to slavery, notwithstanding its bitter denunciations of abolitionists, was lately taken from a post office in Virginia, and in pursuance of the laws of the state, committed to the flames by order of the public authorities; and when the laws are silent, Lynch clubs are ready to visit with infamous and cruel penalties the man who presumes to advocate the inalienable rights of man. What new ramparts could the southern confederacy build around their southern institution? What new weapons could they forge against freedom of discussion?

At the North, the discussion of slavery is now greatly restricted by political and mercenary considerations; but such considerations would become dissipated in a moment by secession. The very demagogues who are now fawning upon the slaveholders for their votes, would, when they had no longer votes to bestow, seek popularity in ultra-hatred slavery.

The anti-slavery agitation at the North, is at present chiefly confined to the religious portion of the community; it would then extend to all classes, and be embittered by national animosity. Slavery would appear more odious and detestable than ever, after having destroyed the fair fabric of the American Union, and severed the ties of kindred and of friendship, to rivet more firmly the fetters of the bondman.

The slaveholders are now our fellow countrymen and citizens; they would then be foreigners who had discarded our friendship and connection, that they might trample with more unrestrained violence upon the rights and liberties of their fellow-men. These considerations show that any expectation of extinguishing or weakening the anti-slavery feeling at North by separation must be utterly futile.

A separation would, moreover, deprive the institution of the protection of the Federal Government. Should the slaves attempt to revolt, the masters would be left to struggle with them, unaided by the fleets and armies of the whole Republic.

And by what power would the master recapture his fugitive who had crossed the boundary of the new empire? Now he may hunt him thro' the whole confederacy, nor is the trembling wretch secure of his liberty, till he beholds the British standard waving above him. Then

* The New York Whig merchants may learn from this candid avowal, that the bare "idea" of the abolition excitement does not make every "husband and father shudder with horror," at the South, whatever it may do in Wall street.

* This assertion will not probably be denied, still it may not be amiss to adduce southern proof of its truth. The Missouri Argus published at St. Louis, speaking, in April, 1839, of an editor in Ohio, remarked, "Mr. Hammond deems the co-operation of the eastern fanatics to be all-important to the success of whiggery, and fears that the timid course of his brother editors on this subject may be productive of mischief. He should recollect, however, that the abolition editors in slave States will not dare to avow their opinions. It would be INSTANT DEATH to them."

freedom would be the boon of every slave who could swim the Ohio, or reach the frontier lines of the free republic. And this frontier line, be it remembered, would be continually advancing South. The anti-slavery feelings of the North, aggravated as they would be by the secession would afford every possible facility to the fugitive and laws would then be passed, not for the protection of human property, but for the protection of human rights.

Would the dissolution of the Union afford the planters a more unrestricted enfoyment of the foreign and domestic slave-trade? Alas! from the moment of separation, slave-trading becomes *piracy* in fact, as well as in name, and the crews of New Orleans and Alexandria, as well as of African slavers, would swing on northern gibbets.

We confess then our utter inability to perceive in what possible mode, a secession of the southern States would tend to guard and perpetuate the institution of slavery.

Would a dissolution of the Union augment the power and the wealth of the slave States? The power and the wealth of a nation depend on its population, industry, and commerce.—The increase of the white population at the South is now small, compared with the wonderful tide of life which is rolling over the western plains. And when the southern region shall be insulated from the sympathies of the whole civilized world, and consecrated to a stern and remorseless despotism,—a despotism sooner or later to be engulfed in blood, by what attraction will it divert the tide of emigration from the fair prairies of the West, to its own sugar and cotton-fields? If, even now, armed patroles must traverse at night the streets and highways that the whites may sleep in safety, and military preparation is essential to domestic security, * what husband or father will take up his residence in the new empire when withdrawn from the protection of the Federal Government and the friendship of its neighbors? The slaves are now rapidly gaining on their masters, and will increase in a still greater ratio after the separation, since the prudent and the enterprising will abandon the doomed region, and few or none will enter it from without. Hence it is obvious that the white population of the southern States could gain no accession from their erection into a separate confederacy.

Would secession augment the wealth of the South? Be it remembered that there is now, no one restriction on southern industry and enterprise which separation would remove. The slaveholders in Congress with rare exceptions, have conducted the affairs of the nation to suit themselves. So far as the interests of the northern manufacturer were indentified with the tariff, they have been sacrificed at the mandate of the cotton-grower; and so far as national legislation can promote the wealth of the South, the statutes are already enacted.

It will not be denied that the larger portion of the strength of the Union—population, money, commerce, and shipping is to be found at the North. In all these elements of national power, the South participates equally with the North. The foreign invader is kept off her shores, and her property abroad is protected from spoliation at least as much by the power of the North as by her own. Her strength for all purposes of defence, is the strength of the Union. What would it be after secession?—True it is, the South would receive Texas into her arms, but she would derive neither honor nor power from the loathsome embrace. Annexation now, would ensure to her the political dominion of the whole Republic, but *after* secession, would cause rather weakness than strength.

As we can discover no possible advantage which the South could derive from secession, we are convinced that the threats of dissolving the Union, which her statesmen are so prodigal in scattering, are the ebullitions of passion, or the devices of policy, rather than the result of mature determination. This conviction is strengthed by still further considerations.

Should the slave States withdraw without any aggression on their rights, but for the sole purpose of enjoying in greater privacy and tranquility the sweets of slavery, they would leave the whole North in a state of high exasperation. The ligaments which have so long bound us together, cannot be ruthlessly and wantonly torn asunder, without causing deep and festering wounds, the consequences of which, the imagination revolts from anticipating. And in what light would the dark and gloomy despotism be viewed by the civilized world? Mankind would behold, and wonder, and despise. The new state would be excluded from the companionship of nations. Her cotton would indeed be still purchased, as we buy the coffee of Hayti; but with the least possible intimacy. Already is our minister at London treated with contumely, because he is a slaveholder—as the representative only of men who had shattered the American Republic to secure the permanency of human bondage, he would not be endured at any court in Europe with the exception of Constantinople. In a few years, the slaves would attain a frightful numerical superiority over their masters. The dread of insurrection within, and of agression from without, would realize the prediction from the holy writ, when men's hearts should fail them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on earth. At length the fatal period would arrive, when, stung with insults and injuries, the new empire would appeal to arms; and should a hostile army land upon its shores, the standard of emancipation would be reared, and slavery would expire in blood. ‖

* "A state of military preparation must always be with us a state of perfect domestic security. A profound peace, and consequent apathy, may expose us to the danger of domestic insurrection."—*Message of Gov. Hayne to the legislature of South Carolina.*

‖ "March 29, 1779. The Committee appointed to take into consideration the circumstances of the southern states, and the ways and means for their safety and defence report—That the State of South Carolina, as rep-

We well know with what indignant feelings these pages will be read at first by many; and fortunate shall we deem ourselves should we escape the imputation of writing to promote insurrection and disunion.' But we appeal from the decision of angry passion, to that of calm reflection. Do we not speak the words of truth and soberness? Do not the signs of the times warrant our predictions? In what respect do the sentiments we have uttered conflict with the lessons of history, or the character of human nature? Do we love the union of the States (!) If such a love can descend by inheritance, we should possess it; if it can be founded on the most thorough conviction of the importance of union not merely to the prosperity of our country, but to the happiness of numerous and beloved children and relatives, we should posses it. If the history of the States of Greece, of Italy, of Holland, of Germany, of South America, and of our own land, demonstrates the blessings of union, and the calamities of separation; then should the prayer of every American ascend to Heaven for the perpetuity of the American Union. But let it be a union for the preservation, not the destruction of liberty: a union cemented by a sacred observance of the constitutional compact; not enforced by gag laws, a censorship of the press, and the abrogation of the right of petition—a union in conformity with the will of God, not in contempt of his authority—a union that shall be regarded as a common blessing, not held as a boon from the South, ever ready to be withdrawn as a penalty for the discharge of moral and political duties.

May Almighty God in mercy, preserve the friends of emancipation, from the sin and folly of even hazarding the Union, by the slightest encroachment on the constitutional rights of the South, and may He give them grace to maintain their own rights in defiance of every menace.

---

resented by the delegates of that State, and by Mr. Hunger who has come hither at the request of the Governor on purpose to explain the particular circumstances thereof, is unable to make any effectual efforts with militia, by reason of the great proportion of citizens necessary to remain at home to prevent insurrection among the negroes, and to prevent the desertion of them to the enemy. That the state of the country and the great numbers of those people among them expose the inhabitants to great danger from the endeavors of the enemy to excite them either to revolt or desert."—*Secret Journal of Congress*, vol. 1. p. 105.

Whether the South Carolinians are from their present "particular circumstances," less in danger from a foreign invader than in 1779, may be seen from the following statement:—in 1790 there were in that state 107,094 slaves, and 140,178 whites; in 1830, the colored population was 323,322, the white only 257,863.

SPEECH OF REV. W. CHANNING.

The following resolution being under consideration by a late Convention of the Anti-slavery citizens of Hamilton county.

1. *Resolved*, That the anti-slavery movement springs from the *christian spirit of brotherhood* which commands us to own all men of every name and nation, clime and complexion as children of our Heavenly Father—from the *Democratic creed of our country*, which declares all men to be born free and equal—and from the social principle of our age which seeks to raise every human being to true manhood, and claims for labor its justly deserved dignity.

MR. CHANNING spoke as follows:

MR. PRESIDENT,—This resolution is an important one, because it expresses the fundamental principles of the anti-slavery movement, and so expresses them as to meet a prevalent prejudice. There are many who affect to think, many probably who do think the anti-slavery "excitement," as they call it, a mere outbreak of fanatic zeal, and class abolitionists among well-meaning visionaries, or turbulent agitators. "Let these fools and notoriety-seekers alone," they contend, "let them see that they are of no importance, and in a few years we shall hear no more of abolition."—Yes, sir! In face of one of the most surprising revolutions that this earth has ever seen—the peaceful establishment of liberty in the British West Indies—in opposition to the opinions of the whole civilized world, these wise men still smile at the extravagance of those who can hope for the elevation of the colored race. To them anti-slavery is a passing fever, the momentary delirium of a band o half-crazed philanthropists.

Now, sir, I like this resolution, because it assigns its true position to the anti-slavery movement, and claims for it the respect it deserves. It describes it as being the natural and necessary result of the religious, political and social spirit of our time; it asserts that it is the fruit of that root of faith, which is the moral life of our age. Later times will do these much censured, much ridiculed abolitionists justice, and recognize them as the van leaders in the army of reform. Let us take this comprehensive view of anti-slavery, and we shall declare and act out its principles, not with sectarian bitterness, not with party bigotry, but with solemn, dignified, disinterested zeal. For one, I believe, therefore will I say, that the indignant protest now thundered forth against slavery throughout the civilized world, is a bright sign that the Divine Spirit is working in the souls of this generation. Anti-slavery should be a part of our religion.

Often as anti-slavery principles have been presented, it is never out of place to discuss them, so long as they are opposed by prejudice or indifferently slighted. Therefore would I attempt in a few words to illustrate the positions assumed in this resolution. The resolution asserts that anti-slavery is the result of that christian love, that political faith in the rights and mutual duties of men, and that social desire

of elevating every individual of every class and rank to the dignity of true manhood, which combine to form the moral atmosphere of our age.

How can we demonstrate axioms, how can we prove what is self-evident? And yet these incontrovertible positions are denied, denied by professing christians, by so called statesmen, and by those who would scorn to be thought behind their times. Let us take up these three positions in order.

The anti-slavery movement springs from the christian spirit of brotherhood. Strange, that any one who has listened to Jesus Christ, ever looked up into his benignant eyes, ever seen his smile, or heard his tones of love, can doubt whether he would have tolerated the thought of man holding man as property. To him the human race was one large family, embraced in the Providence of one Heavenly Father.—"Brethren," this is the only name for christians. A christian holding a fellow christian as a thing, a chattel, a tool, a brute! It is a monstrous outrage upon Jesus Christ, to suppose that he could have borne with such an abuse of humanity. Oh, ye learned divines, vindicating the right and duty of owning men; ye slaveholding preachers, soothing the consciences of buyers and sellers of souls; ye elders and deacons driving your brother christians with a whip; how can ye be waked from that sleep, where conscience is deaf? Do you believe in that hope which so many christians hold, that the Prince of Peace is to return to reign in righteousness upon the earth, to make this world once more an Eden? Do you daily pray, and constantly hope to be admitted among pure, loving, happy spirits into the Kingdom of God? You do! Well, Suppose that at this hour the trumpet should sound, and with the brightness of noon added to noontide, and with attendant crowds of blessed ones rejoicing in perfect goodness, the Judge should come—how would you stand before that incarnate power of Justice and Mercy? What would you say? Come into his presence, with your colony of slaves, bent with toil, seamed with lashes, ragged and dirty, ignorant and rude, helpless and vicious; and can you say, I ask you by the solemnity of conscience, can you say, with that deep penetrating eye of love, full upon you, "thou gavest unto me five talents, lo! I have gained five others?" No, no, friend, the thoughts of the minds you had cramped, the hearts you had imprisoned, the energies you had perverted to your own purposes would overcome you then; "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto the *least of my brethren*, ye have done it unto me."

But take a different view, suppose that Christ is to come again, not visibly, but in the triumph of his principles, in the prevalence of his spirit, in filling human hearts with the love that overflowed in waters of life from him; and I ask any one whether owning man as property, using him as a thing, is not at this moment just as explicitly condemned by christianity as if the Judge in visible presence passed sentence. Jesus taught that all men were destined to immortal life, all alike intended by God to be quickened in soul, strengthened in goodness, restored to the image of God; that this was the end of life; that every man had a heaven-given right to the best opportunity for the growth of mind, heart, and power; that man owed to his brother immortal the most efficient aid which he could extend to him, for his spiritual elevation. Now are these grand ends of life compatible with slavery? Does not slavery as a principle, and an institution, virtually and actually deny that slaves are men or to be treated like men, the world over; has it not been thought necessary to check, as far as possible, the growth of a slave's spiritual nature, except in so far, perhaps, as making him conscientious, may keep him quiet, through meekness, under wrongs? But talking about matters so plain, may darken with words, truths self-luminous. *A slave is a thing*, and it matters not how kind, how pure, how zealous may be the master, an inevitable necessity prevents him from treating what he can buy and sell as property, like a brother-immortal. But again, christianity teaches that every human being receives his spiritual life from God, that God is working in every human soul to will and to do his good pleasure; the life of every spirit in human form is God's spirit. The pretence of owning men implies therefore, necessarily, the impious claim of *owning God*. Check the man's growth, and you are checking God; burden his soul, and you are laying earth's fetters on the Holy Ghost. Yes, it is no exaggeration, it is the plain fact, that just so far as human power can do it, slavery thwarts the purposes of the infinite Being, in breathing the breath of life into man and making him a living soul. It would be weakness to think or to admit for an instant, that this desecration of the "life of God in the soul of man," is compatible with the christian spirit of brotherhood. The master, who does not hold himself responsible to Heaven as a *guardian* of the beings intrusted to his care, who does not seek as his chief end their elevation, who does not labour and pray for their *deliverance*, who does not utterly deny that these men are his property, is not and cannot be a christian, be he bishop, presbyter, or layman. The anti-slavery movement springs from that respect for man as a child of God, that hope for man as a spirit destined to immortality, that love for man as a fellow-heir of Heaven which christian faith necessarily inspires. And it is one proof that the spirit of Jesus is triumphing over selfishness, and that christendom is in some degree becoming christian, that the consciences of men have at last awakened to a recognition of the rights of the slave.

The rights of the slave! Yes sir, the inalienable rights of the slave as a human being! And this brings us to the second position assumed in the resolution, that the anti-slavery movement springs from the democratic creed, that all men are born free and equal. It is the fashion among some degenerate Americans, to say, (and many secretly think who would blush to say,) that these immortal words in the Decla-

ration of Independence are *mere abstractions*, rather unworthy, on the whole, of the cool, sagacious, common sense of the Fathers of the Revolution. What would Adams, Jefferson, and the others of that illustrious band say to these modern sages? Why! that these abstractions had worked the mighty creation of a new order of society. On those two words, which modern sophistry would dissipate, rests this nation.—Freedom and equality are the corner-stone of our Institutions. And shame on us, as a people! that we have been so false to the very first article of our political faith. The glorious opportunity was afforded this nation of setting an example to the world, of a true state of humanity. Alas, we have sold our birthright. The world no longer owns us as the standard-bearer of freedom. But because we have been false, Providence has not been faithless. In the American Revolution, democracy was born; and *democracy is no abstraction*, as all slaveholders of all names and kinds, in every land, must sooner or later learn. And now this spirit of Democracy, which recognizes the rights of each individual man, returns from its mission through the world to drive us, as a people, to our work. It taunts us with our hypocritical professions, it ridicules us for our empty boasts, it sternly rebukes us for our broken vows. Heaven grant, that the scorn of the civilized earth may be keen enough to goad us into fidelity to our responsibilities as a Nation. But better things may be said. Democracy among ourselves (and I use the word not in the narrow party sense, but in the large universal sense, as representing the spirit of liberty,) Democracy among ourselves acknowledges the shameful contrast between our unlimited assertion of individual rights, and our actual denial of all rights, domestic, social, political and religious, to one sixth of our citizens. Throughout our own nation, at least throughout the free States, the democratic spiit is acting with renewed strength; and it teaches every aspiring and just man to feel for those, whose lot is degradation, whose homes are desecrated, whose labors enrich only others, whose souls are not their own, whose manhood is crushed by chains.

And this, sir, brings us to the third position assumed in the resolution, which is, that the anti-slavery movement springs from "the social principle of our age, which seeks to raise every individual to true manhood, and claims its justly deserved dignity for labor." The dignity of labor—ay, let those words be repeated, the dignity of labor. They are the watch-words of reform. In nothing has slavery injured our country more, than in breathing abroad an effeminate, unmanly contempt for honest toil. The sages of the South tell us that a laboring man cannot be intelligent enough, elevated enough in character, to take a worthy part in the government of a nation. Labor, is the badge of the slave at the South; idleness the insignia of the noble.—Thin-skinned, white-handed gentry are alone worthy to wield the sceptre. What say you! oh "white slaves" of the North, to this doctrine? Are you weak enough to be ashamed of a brown skin and a callous palm? Do you feel most like men, when fattening on the toils of others, or when honestly earning your bread in the sweat of your brow? Alas! that truth bids us to say, that this miserable spirit of aristocracy has pervaded to some degree, the minds of the North. Young men among us spurn the work-shop and the field. Their hands are too delicate to use the plough and the harrow, held by their fathers to earn that competence by which they have been nurtured and educated, And so long as slavery exists among us, will this unworthy stigma attach to labor; so long will it be thought a merit to grow rich rapidly by any means, rather than to be useful in productive toils; unless indeed we say as we may with truth say, that this wasteful speculation, as well as slavery springs from the mercenary, grasping, selfish spirit which has been the bane of our country. But a brighter day is coming.—Every where we see manifestations that a higher standard of manhood is introduced, and that men are becoming valued for what they are, not for what they have.

The day is not far distant when it will be a disgrace to a man to be an idler, when laborious usefulness will be the only claim to honor and confidence. Labor disgraceful! when the Infinite Majesty of heaven and earth worketh forever! Shame on the man willing to be fed like a stall-fattened brute, without co-operating with the universe around him; double shame on him that is willing to let others do for him what he thinks would be unworthy of himself! If labor is really demeaning, the obligation becomes only the stronger that I should do what would disgrace another; if labor is really deadening to the intellect and soul, I am robbing a man of more than outward goods, even of the life of his spirit, to let him break his back and strain his limbs for me. Working men of the North! prove by your own example, that this assertion that labor is the badge of the slave is a libel.—But why talk thus tamely? why not retort the charge? Idleness is the badge of the slave, Yea! he that cannot work is the slave, the slave of circumstances. Only he who is strong and brave, and enterprising and enduring, is free.—The man who can work, is a man—he only—and the world is his. Nature works with him, God works with him ever more. The social spirit of our time asserts that it is possible, & easy for the laboring classes to obtain thorough intellectual and moral culture, and that labor is an aid not a hindrance in the acquisition of manliness virtue, intelligence and peace. The laboring men of the South then may be elevated; in proportion to their elevation will be the efficiency of their toil. And now that the time I have already occupied warns me to close, let me end with the sentiments, Honor to the slave!—Honor to the oppressed brother wasting life in the cane field and rice swamp! Yes! oh planter, lolling at thy ease in the piazza, weaving dreams of policy for this free-land, my *pity* is for thee, my *honor* for that bent and toiling slave.

THE WORKING MAN'S FRIEND.

It cannot be denied that the laboring classes are, in every nation, the source of wealth and comfort, and that they are the strength and defence of every Government is equally true. Divest a nation of day laborers, farmers, and mechanics, and utter ruin must be the result. The laboring classes are so numerous, and the blessings they pour upon the nation so common and so abundant that like springs and mighty rivers that enrich and fertilize the earth, they have ceased to be valued. The laboring classes are as essential to the existence of a nation as water is to that of life and vegetation. Consequently; whatever tends to injure these classes, press upon the vitals of the nation. All classes in community are fed and clothed by the hand of the laborer. Dry up the fountains of industry and nakedness and starvation will pervade the land. It is obvious then that the interest of the laboring classes is the fundamental and important interest of every nation. Other classes of society have their utility. The professional and mercantile classes are subservient to the laboring classes, are in fact but laborers in different departments, and their heir interests should not be neglected. To secure and promote the interests of the laboring classes is to secure and promote the interests of all others, and therefore should be the primary policy in the government of every nation. All laws and institutions bearing inperiously upon the laboring part of society should be abolished, because necessarily inperious to the whole community. And in the United States it is in the power of the free laboring classes, by the proper exercise of the right of suffrage, to abolish all laws and institutions bearing injuriously upon the working part of the nation, and it is their duty as well their interest to use their rightful power for such purposes. In securing their own interests in this respect, they will secure the best interests of the nation at large. And to them an appeal is now made in relation to the institution of slavery. It is proposed to show that this institution bears most injuriously on the free laboring classes of society, and that of course, is against the best interests of the nation as a whole.

Slavery associates labor with the degraded slave, and this association becomes so permanently fixed in the mind, and so entirely interwoven with the customs of society, that it so fastens upon the free laborer that he is viewed as occupying the place of a slave, and of course he is shoved out of respectable society. Every one who reads the public papers knows that slaveholders represent the laboring population of the free states as being degraded to a level with their slaves, and as being even in a worse condition. Even Henry Clay supposes them to be so ignorant and degraded that he charges the abolitionists with designing an amalgamation between them and the colored people. Had not Mr. Clay believed them to be exceedingly degraded he would not have charged, as he did, in the Senate of the United States, the abolitionists with designing to have the free white laborers marry with the colored people.

The association of labor with a degraded state easily passes from the slave states to the free, and consequently, many in the free states treat their laborers as nearly like slaveholders treat slaves as the state of society will permit. As if slaves, they give them their rough morsel by themselves in the kitchen. Who does not know the fact that the hired girl, is by many, pent in the kitchen, and no more permitted to come to the table, or to mingle with respectable company than if a slave? And why? Because labor is associated with the degraded state of the slave. She, in their estimation, is occupying the place of the slave. Many would think it a deep disgrace to walk the streets with a hired girl, although her moral character were even so fair. Such are the bearings of slavery upon the free laboring classes. Senator Wickliffe a wealthy slaveholder of Kentucky calls free laborers "*white negroes.*" The following are given as his remarks in the Senate of Kentucky.

"Gentlemen wanted to drive out the black population that they might obtain white negroes in their place. How inconsistent has been their conduct! They had a Democratic white population—the real tenents of log cabins—the plain but comely matron with her swarm of young log cabin Democrats around her; but they have disappeared to make room for Durham short-horns, and Woburn pigs. For every imported Durham, a yeoman of the country, a voter of the State, has been sent to the far West. But now gentlemen want kind of white population. Not such yeoman as their Durhams and Woburn pigs have displaced; but white negroes, who, like the white negroes of Europe can be rendered subservient and brought to the polls in thousands. White negroes have this advantage over black negroes—they can be converted into voters; and then men who live upon the sweat of their brow and pay them but a dependent and scanty subsistence can, if able to keep ten thousand of them in employment, come up to the polls and change the destiny of the country.

How improved will be our condition when we have such white negroes as perform the servile labors of Europe—of old England—and he would add, now of New England—where our body servants, and our cart drivers, and our street sweepers, and our shoe blacks, are white negroes instead of black. Where will be the independence—the proud spirit and the chivalry of Kentuckians then? with white negroes in rags and dependence surrounding him, will the Kentuckian be what he has been in time past?"

Such is the contemptuous and degrading language of this haughty slaveholder in relation to free laborers. The man, or the woman wholabors, he calls a *white negro*, a slave! whatever even may be his or her character!! It is not enough to trample upon the poor colored man and degrade him to the level of the beast; but the laboring white man must be brought equally low;—color forms to him no shield against the aggressions of the slaveholder. He must be called a *white negro*, that is, in plain language, a *white slave.* Will, the laboring classes any longer take sides with oppressors who dispise and degrade them, and call them *white negroes.* meaning *white slaves?* So long as slavery exists laboring men and women will be despised without regard to color, because so long as it exists so long will labor be

associated with a degraded state. Consequently, the abolition of slavery is essential to the honorable station the free laboring classes ought to occupy. None are worthy of more respect than honest and industrious laborers. They are, in fact, the bone, and nerve, and wealth, and defence of the nation. Strike from the nation the day-laborer, the farmer, and mechanic, and where will be the source of strength, wealth, and defence of the nation? Yet all the classes are despised, by the slaveholder, because they labor as do his slaves. Because they do what he esteems business fit only for slaves, he calls them *white negroes! white slaves!* Let slavery be abolished, and labor will no longer be associated with a degraded state, and the laborer will no more be despised.

Slavery tends to prevent the free laboring classes from gaining wealth.

Slaveholders have monopolized nearly two thirds of the populated territory of the United States, and that too of the best soil, and in the mildest climate; and by working men and women without wages, have, to great extent, excluded free laborers from the advantages of so vast and fertile a tract of country, and compelled them to croud together on a little more than one third of the territory they would otherwise have possessed. Thus slavery has robbed the free laboring classes of nearly two thirds of the field of enterprise, and of the part on which they might most easily have supported their families, and enriched themselves. Slaveholders have introduced into this territory millions of slaves and this enables them to shut out the free laborer. The slave population is the entire result of slavery; but for it, there would have been no colored people in the United States. Slavery then has vastly increased the number of laborers, and by working them without wages, has denied employment to the free laborer, and has banished him to the free states. Slave holders still hold this vast territory and, by breeding slaves for market, by smuggling slaves in from Africa, and by compelling females to work in the fields they are still increasing slave laborers to the injury of free-laborers; and they will continue to do this until slavery is abolished. In three respects the abolition of slavery will decrease the number of laborers. Slaves will not be brought in from Africa, the females will not be compelled to work in the fields as men. To abolish slavery then will increase the demand for laborers, and secure better wages. It will also open a vast field for free labor enterprise. The never fireying streams of the South would soon be thickly set with manufactuies; and the lands would be more extensively and skilfully cultivated by the hand of the free laborer. The colored population when free will consume vastly more of the Northern products than when slaves. This will increase the demand for Northern manufacturies, and enable the farmers and mechanics to increase their wealth, extend their enterprises, employ more laborers and give better wages. If slavery were abolished the slave states would populate more densely than the free states have done. They possess more good soil, a mild climate and more valuable products; and consequently are capable of suporting a more dense population; and they would if free, open a market which the present free states would be unable to supply; of course all classes of industrious men would be enriched. Thus the Abolition of Slavery add immeasurably to the wealth of all classes of society.

From these facts and statements, it is easy to see that slavery is a deep and deadly curse to the nation, and peculiarly oppressive and degrading to the laboring classes. The common laborer and mechanic have been banished from the largest and fairest portion of the land, and the proud monopolizing slaveholder compares them to "Gothis and Vandals," even the most ignorant and barberous races of men. Will common laborers, farmers and mechanics permit a system to exist which wages deadly war with their best interest and dearest rights, and heaps disgrace upon their honorable and useful occupations, when they have power safely to vote it out of the Union? There are but a few hundred thousand slaveholders in the nation. Consequently if the free laboring men of the nation will but unite in carrying the subject to the poles they can soon vote slavery out of the Union, and thus abolish it peacefully. There are yet in many of the slave states, non-slaveholders enough to vote the slaves free, and it is in the power of the free states by constitutional legislation to render slavery as unprofitable to individuals as it now is to the state, and to do this would soon abolish slavery. Now why should not common laborers, farmers, and mechanics unite to abolish their worst enemy, and the worst enemy of our race? They have the power to do it, and maintain both the peace and unity of the nation. No evil can result from doing it,—it will not increase the colored population; it will not bring any more of them to the free states, nor will it in the least increase the amalgamation of the races, or in any way compel any one to associate with colored people. So long as slavery exists it will increase the number of colored people, and force more of them into the free states; it will amalgamate the races more rapidly and it will make a more formidable competition with the labor of white people; it will wage more and more deadly war with the liberty of the free population; and it will make still more powerful efforts to reduce the free labor to the level of the slave. Why then should we not unite peacefully and firmly in abolishing this prominent source our poverty, degradation and misery? Why should we sin against our own best interests? Why should we offend God by shutting up our bounty of compassion from the poor colored man. He has a heart to feel as well as we—the law of God requires us to love him as we love ourselves, and to do to him as we would others do to us.

THE BLACKSMITH'S SON.

FACTS FOR THE PEOPLE.

No. X.

ADDRESS,

OF THE NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.

To the Citizens of the United States:

THE NATIONAL CONVENTION of the friends of liberty, in the U. S., convened in the city of New York, on the 12th and 13th of May, 1841, for the purpose of considering the propriety of nominating candidates for President and Vice President of the United States, to be supported by them at the next election, having with great unanimity, agreed upon the adoption of that measure, and having unanimously selected as their candidates James G. Birney, of New York, for President, and Thomas Morris, of Ohio, for Vice President, consider it fikewise proper to accompany the announcement of this result of their deliberations, with a brief statement of the reasons which have impelled them to adopt this policy, and an explicit avowal of the principles by which in their associatod political action, they consider themselves under obligation to be governed.

We find the government of the United States, as a matter of existing fact, under the control of the slave power.

On a review of the political history of the country, we find that the general government, under all its successivo administrations, since the adoption of the present Constitution, has been wielded by the slave power, for its own perpetuity, extension, and supremacy, not simply in a neglect of the great interests of the country at large, and especially of the free States, but in actual and persevering hostility to those interests, and that too, in the presence of abundant testimony on the part of slaveholding statesmen themselves, (whether avowedly friendly or unfriendly to the perpetuity of the slave system,) to the great truth that the interests of free and slave labor cannot be reconciled with each other, and that freedom and slavery can not long co-exist under the same government.

While the Jeffersons, the Washingtons, the Pinckneys, the Henrys, and the other prominent statesmen of the South who may be reckoned among the friends of free institutions for the white man, have with one voice assured us that they expected to secure this inestimable blessing by no process which should not include the emancipation of the colored man—on the other hand, the Leighs, the McDuffies, the Calhouns, the Clays, the Dews, and other prominent statesmen, and leading minds of the South, who have argued for the perpetuity of the slave system, have, at the same time, very significantly admitted that they do not expect to secure the object of their wishes at a less expense than the ultimate enslavement of the great mass of the laboring population of the country, northern and southern, and totally irrespective of complexion.

During the fifty-two years of our national history, under the present constitution, the office of President has been held by a slaveholder, forty years.

The slave power has held the supremacy in our national councils during the entire period of our national existonce, and under the administration of all the contending parties that have, in turn, ruled over the destinies of the country.

Under the reign of the Slave Power over this nation, we have witnessed the national diplomacy and the treaty-making power uniformly and efficiently subservient to the interests of slavery, at the expense of the national honor.

The slave power has moulded the measures of the national government in all its internal regulations, and its political economy, in subservicncy to the wishes of the slaveholders, and in opposition to the interests and general wishes of the non-slaveholding States.

It has established a national bank, then declared it unconstitutional and broken it down—again re-established it, and again broken it down at its pleasure—just as its own supposed interests might seem, for the time being, to require.

It has prescribed and prohibited foreign commerce, it has clamored for domestic manufactures, and a protective tariff, again, it has demanded and obtained the abandonment of that policy, and a return to free trade, on the threat of a dissolution of the Union, unless the free labor States would concede to the demand.

It has declared war, under pretence of protecting that foreign commerce, carried on by the free North, which, at the same time, it declared to be a national curse, and which, the measures it dictated, including the war, were adapted, if not intended to annihilate.

It has shown, in its conduct of that war, and particularly in its sham invasion of Canada, which it dared not annex to the free North, that the preservation and aggrandizement of itself, were more regarded than the vindication of the national honor.

It has terminated that war by a treaty of Peace, in which no redress was obtained for the past, and no security stipulation for the future.

It has therefore, in effect, levied a tax of many millions of dollars upon the free laboring North, to sustain the expenses of a war of aggression upon its own interests and its own rights.

In all this, it has manifestly sought to preserve the balance of power between the impoverished South, and the more prosperous and industrious North, by crippling the energies of the latter, and reducing it, as nearly as possible, to the level of the former.

The immenso pecuniary sacrifices and burdens thus imposed upon the free laboring North, by the action of the Slave power through the National Government, has become still more insupportable, in consequence of other depredations upon our free labor by a process, which no national administration can prevent, otherwiso than by contributing the aid of its constitutional authority, for the overthrow of slavery itself. We allude now to the mercantile and financial losses to the free North, which must unavoidably result from its business connections with the pauperised South. Losses which can only be guarded against by a total non-intercourso between the free and slave States, or by the abolition of the slave system itself.

There is abundant data for the belief that no slaveholding community, relying on slave labor for its agricultural products, ever supported, or can support itself, but by direct or indirect supplies from, or depredations upon other communities with which it holds intercourse.

God never intended that one half or two thirds of a community should subsist upon the unrequited labor of the other half. A slight acquaintance with history may assure us that it never yet has been done. And a very moderate stock of common sense and common arithmetic may serve to convince any candid inquirer, that it never can be done.

It is will understood that the British West India Islands, previous to the glorious act of abolition, were dependent on the mother country, not only for their military defence against their plundered agriculturists, but also for their pecuniary means of escaping the horrors of starvation.

It has been affirmed that the slaveholding North American Provinces were brought into the measure of join-

FACTS FOR THE PEOPLE.

No. X.

ADDRESS,

OF THE NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.

To the Citizens of the United States:

THE NATIONAL CONVENTION of the friends of liberty, in the U. S., convened in the city of New York, on the 12th and 13th of May, 1841, for the purpose of considering the propriety of nominating candidates for President and Vice President of the United States, to be supported by them at the next election, having with great unanimity, agreed upon the adoption of that measure, and having unanimously selected as their candidates James G. Birney, of New York, for President, and Thomas Morris, of Ohio, for Vice President, consider it likewise proper to accompany the announcement of this result of their deliberations, with a brief statement of the reasons which have impelled them to adopt this policy, and an explicit avowal of the principles by which in their associated political action, they consider themselves under obligation to be governed.

We find the government of the United States, as a matter of existing fact, under the control of the slave power.

On a review of the political history of the country, we find that the general government, under all its successive administrations, since the adoption of the present Constitution, has been wielded by the slave power, for its own perpetuity, extension, and supremacy, not simply in a neglect of the great interests of the country at large, and especially of the free States, but in actual and persevering hostility to those interests, and that too, in the presence of abundant testimony on the part of slaveholding statesmen themselves, (whether avowedly friendly or unfriendly to the perpetuity of the slave system,) to the great truth that the interests of free and slave labor cannot be reconciled with each other, and that freedom and slavery can not long co-exist under the same government.

While the Jeffersons, the Washingtons, the Pinckneys, the Henrys, and the other prominent statesmen of the South who may be reckoned among the friends of free institutions for the white man, have with one voice assured us that they expected to secure this inestimable blessing by no process which should not include the emancipation of the colored man—on the other hand, the Leighs, the McDuffies, the Calhouns, the Clays, the Dews, and other prominent statesmen, and leading minds of the South, who have argued for the perpetuity of the slave system, have, at the same time, very significantly admitted that they do not expect to secure the object of their wishes at a less expense than the ultimate enslavement of the great mass of the laboring population of the country, northern and southern, and totally irrespective of complexion.

During the fifty-two years of our national history, under the present constitution, the office of President has been held by a slaveholder, forty years.

The slave power has held the supremacy in our national councils during the entire period of our national existence, and under the administration of all the contending parties that have, in turn, ruled over the destinies of the country.

Under the reign of the Slave Power over this nation, we have witnessed the national diplomacy and the treaty-making power uniformly and efficiently subservient to the interests of slavery, at the expense of the national honor.

The slave power has moulded the measures of the national government in all its internal regulations, and ~~its political servility, in subserviency~~ to the wishes of the slaveholders, and in opposition to the interests and general wishes of the non-slaveholding states.

It has established a national bank, then declared it unconstitutional and broken it down—again re-established it, and again broken it down at its pleasure—just as its own supposed interests might seem, for the time being, to require.

It has proscribed and prohibited foreign commerce, it has clamored for domestic manufactures, and a protective tariff; again, it has demanded and obtained the abandonment of that policy, and a return to free trade, on the threat of a dissolution of the Union, unless the free labor States would concede to the demand.

It has declared war, under pretence of protecting that foreign commerce, carried on by the free North, which, at the same time, it declared to be a national curse, and which, the measures it dictated, including the war, were adapted, if not intended to annihilate.

It has shown, in its conduct of that war, and particularly in its sham invasion of Canada, which it dared not annex to the free North, that the preservation and aggrandizement of itself, were more regarded than the vindication of the national honor.

It has terminated that war by a treaty of Peace, in which no redress was obtained for the past, and no security stipulation for the future.

It has therefore, in effect, levied a tax of many millions of dollars upon the free laboring North, to sustain the expenses of a war of aggression upon its own interests and its own rights.

In all this, it has manifestly sought to preserve the balance of power between the impoverished South, and the more prosperous and industrious North, by crippling the energies of the latter, and reducing it, as nearly as possible, to the level of the former.

The immense pecuniary sacrifices and burdens thus imposed upon the free laboring North, by the action of the Slave power through the National Government, has become still more insupportable, in consequence of other depredations upon our free labor by a process, which no national administration can prevent, otherwise than by contributing the aid of its constitutional authority, for the overthrow of slavery itself. We allude now to the mercantile and financial losses to the free North, which must unavoidably result from its business connections with the pauperised South. Losses which can only be guarded against by a total non-intercourse between the free and slave States, or by the abolition of the slave system itself.

There is abundant data for the belief that no slaveholding community, relying on slave labor for its agricultural products, ever supported, or can support itself, but by direct or indirect supplies from, or depredations upon other communities with which it holds intercourse.

God never intended that one half or two thirds of a community should subsist upon the unrequited labor of the other half. A slight acquaintance with history may assure us that it never yet has been done. And a very moderate stock of common sense and common arithmetic may serve to convince any candid inquirer, that it never can be done.

It is will understood that the British West India Islands, previous to the glorious act of abolition, were dependent on the mother country, not only for their military defence against their plundered agriculturists, but also for their pecuniary means of escaping the horrors of starvation.

It has been affirmed that the slaveholding North American Provinces were brought into the measure of join-

ing the Northern and Eastern Provinces in their revolutionary struggle against Great Britain, chiefly by the belief that a war would confiscate or wipe out, in some way, the debt due from the slaveholding planters to the merchants of England, and which they were unable to pay.

From that time to the present, it is not believed that twenty years have at any period elapsed, (and seldom more than ten years,) without a general bankruptcy among the planters of the slave States, the burden of which has fallen ultimately, upon their importers, their mechanics, their artizans, their manufacturers, and their bankers; and these reside, chiefly, in the non-slaveholding States.

The first National Bank owed its charter mainly to the fact that southern bankruptcy needed loans from some source which the South could not supply, and which its ingenuity could not devise, without a mingling up of its own credit with that of the free laboring North, in a common partnership bank. The same bank lost its charter because the South had become indebted to it, and to the northern merchants beyond their ability to pay, and therefore, it became convenient to bury the creditor and his collecting agent in one common grave.

The second National Bank owed its birth and its death to the same causes.

Boston was overwhelmed with sudden and unexpected bankruptcy in 1828, because she had sold her domestic manufactures and imported goods to the South, and the South was unable to pay.

A similar visitation, connected in part, with the cotton speculations, (commenced at the South, and ended at the North, in 1826,) was inflicted upon the city of N Y.

Again, in 1837, something like 100 millions of dollars was lost, to the city of New York, and to other northern cities, towns, and villages, in proportion, from a similar cause.

The loss of 90 millions of dollars, by the States of Maryland, Virginia, and Kentucky, in 1838, in consequence of the refusal of the Mississippians to pay for the slaves illegally imported into that State, fell ultimately, of course, (notwithstanding the recent decision of the Supreme Court,) upon the northern people, who had trusted them, in various forms, to the full amout of the supposed proceeds of the slave traffic of 1836 and '7.

Northern funds, to vast amounts, have been engulphed, and lost forever, in the Pontine marches of Southern Banks, and Southern Stocks. Northern Banks, within a few months past, have suspended or stopped specie payment because they had purchased, or been founded upon, Southern State Stocks.

It is now well known that the late United States Bank (of Pennsylvania) was ruined chiefly by its connection with the slaveholding South.

Such are a few specimens of a class of facts, of which we can scarcely present the condensed outline.

In such circumstances it is, that we find ourselves under the control of a National Government, governed by the slave power.

Nor are mere pecuniary burdens and embarrassments the sole, or the most grievous items in our catalogue of complaints. We only see in them the symbol of sore chastisements. We read in them the evidence that we are beginning to taste the bitter fruits of a corrupt tree—that wee are reaping the deserved penalty of past transgression.

The same slave power that plunders our purses has declared open war upon our civil, political, and religious freedom,

And the menace has already proved itself to be no idle threat.

Already is our right of petition cloven down, and the first thrill of alarm that was felt, for a time, through the free States, seems subsiding, and setting down into the calm of quiet submission to a despotism too formidable to be successfully grappled with!

The lawless violence, riots, mobs, arsons, lynchings, and murders, with which the slave power has attempted to fortify itself, both in the free and the slave States, instead of having been discountenanced and checked by our National and State governments, have been countenanced by the tone of Executive messages, and by the action of the Post Office Department of the Federal Government.

In connection with all this, and more than all this, we see reason to apprehend that the long-deferred punishment of our great national sin, is now about to be visited upon us, and with a weight proportioned to the Divine forbearance that has given us, as a people, the opportunity of filling up the measure of our national guilt. If a Jefferson could tremble fifty years ago under the apprehension that God is just, and that his justice cannot sleep forever, shall we be considered fanatical for entertaining similar sentiments, after so fearful an addition to the just grounds of that fear.

The intolerable national disgrace of transforming the seat of our National Government into the most extensive, odious, and brutalizing slave market in the known world—a market by means of which parents are separated from children, and children from parents, husbands from wives, and wives from husbands—a traffic which has been presented as a nuisance by a grand jury of the Federal District itself—a traffic described in the petition of Judge Cranch, and eleven hundred citizens of the District, as being more cruel in its operations, and more demoralizing in its effects than the African slave trade itself, which has been prohibited by our own laws as piracy—such a disgrace, we cannot but regard as altogether insupportable by a free people, fatal to the preservation of liberty, and involving a degree of national guilt, which must be purged away at all hazards, and without any delay or compromise.

At no former period of our national history had it become so fully demonstrated, as at present, that no national administration will ever break the bonds of the slave power that has hitherto controlled us, unless it be an administration that comes into power for this distinct end, and is supported for this object, as being of paramount claims and of all-controlling importance.

That the late administration was chained to the car of the slave power, we need not waste time to make manifest. Equally plain is it, that the administration that succeeded it on the 4th of March last, was equally suppliant and servile. When it comes to be publicly announced by the President himself that no member of his cabinet expects to hold his place on any other condition than that of being known as standing aloof from the support of human freedom, the question is settled beyond the possibility of a mistake, that the administration is proslavery, and holds the support of the slave system paramount to the national welfare, and the national honor. Nor will it be claimed that anything more favorable to the cause of liberty is to be expected, from the recent elevation of a slaveholder to the Chief Magistracy of the republic.

There seems to be no evidence that the party defeated at the last Presidential elections will seek to retrieve its fortunes by any measures which will not include its accustomed subserviency to the slave power.

Both the prominent political parties then, must be regarded as permanently hostile to the great interests of human freedom. Whatever good they may propose to accomplish, the support of the fundamental principles of liberty, cannot be reckoned as within the range of their endeavors. Whatever abuses they may promise to remove, they stand fully pledged to the support of the greatest civil, political, and moral evil, with which the nation is disgraced and burdened.

To say, then, that we will not, as friends of liberty, nominate our own candidates for office, is to say, either that we will abandon political life entirely, or that our political activities shall be wielded in the support of oppression, and against the foundation principles of our republican institutions. Neither of these positions are we prepared to assume, and therefore we cheerfully accept the only alternative in our power.

To defer nominating in the hope that one or both the present political parties will nominate friends of liberty, would be to hope not only without, but against evidence.

No intelligent body of men will ever attempt to elect a President of the United States, without seeking in their

candidate either one or the other of the two following qualifications, viz: First, that he shall promote the interests of slavery, or second, that he shall seek its constitutional overthrow.

Candidates may be recommended to different classes of citizens as possessing both these opposite qualities. But none will be seriously supported, without claiming they possess either one or the other of them.

If any body of men should nominate presidential candidates on the ground, honestly and openly avowed, that they are hostile to slavery, then that body of men would become, by that very act, an anti-slavery party in politics.

Had the friends of liberty now assembled in this convention declined, making their nominations on the ground that some other body of men would probably nominate friends of liberty, they would have involved themselves in the absurdity and the disgrace of saying that they would not themselves do the work which the exigencies of the republic require, because they were in hopes that another class of men, more consistent and more ardent than themselves would do the work for them. It would have been declining to act as an anti-slavery party, because they preferred that somebody else should do so; for neither the whig, nor democratic, nor any other party can avoid being either a pro-slavery or an anti-slavery party in politics.

These reasons satisfy our own minds that a nomination should be made by the friends of liberty, for themselves, and we know of no reasons why the nomination should be deferred.

In respect to the candidates selected we have no occasion to say a word by way either of explanation or eulogy.

To those in our republic who love liberty, and who acquaint themselves with the history of passing events, the bare announcement of their names will be sufficient for all the purposes we wish to subserve. In exercising the inalienable right of every citizen to recommend candidates for office, we only ask that their qualifications may be examined and that a judgment be formed in accordance with the facts of the case. We ask none of our friends to vote for them, unless, in their own consciences, they think them mentally and morally qualified to hold the offices for which they are nominated. But we ask, in the name of bleeding humanity, of outraged justice, of disgraced republicanism, and of heaven's own truth, for a conscientious and hearty union of all the friends of liberty, in the support of able, wise, good, and "just men," who will "rule in the fear of God," "execute judgment between a man and his neighbor," "deliver the spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor," "defend the poor and needy," and use civil government for the very object for which it was instituted among men.

In the light of the considerations already presented, it can scarcely be necessary to frame a separate argument to show the necessity of nominating tried friends of liberty, disconnected with either of the servile parties, to represent us in the Congress of the United States.—There it is that the great battle is emphatically to be fought, and experience has shown that the work requires men who cannot be diverted from their purpose, or induced to compromise their principles or postpone the claims of equity, from any considerations growing out of their political connection with the slave power. It avails us little that our members of Congress are chosen exclusively by northern votes, so long as the voters, abolitionists and all, confine their suffrages to candidates selected for them by parties dependent for their power upon the favor of the slaveholding South. When we see a slaveholder clothed with the controlling power of Speaker of the House of Representatives by the votes of anti-slavery members of that body, and hear them advocate a future instead of a present abolition of slavery in the federal District for the avowed object of securing the election of a pro-slavery President and a slaveholding Vice President, the policy of supporting such members of Congress by anti-slavery votes becomes too plain a matter for an extended argument. On this policy, the abolition of slavery in the federal District will always have to be spoken of as still future.

The next problem for the friends of liberty to dispose of, is that which relates to the policy of carrying this great question not only into our presidential and congressional elections, but likewise into our state, county, township, city and other local elections; of nominating all the candidates for civil office for which free citizens are called upon to give their votes, and thus separating ourselves entirely and forever from both and from all the other political parties in our country.

In every view we have been able to take of the question, and whether we examine it as a matter of policy or of principle, we have been unable to arrive at any other conclusion than that which calls for the entire separation just described, and for the independent nomination by the friends of liberty, for all the offices in the gift of the people.

If it be true, as has already been affirmed, that both and that all the political parties of the country not avowedly and openly anti-slavery in their character, are, and forever must be, pro-slavery, until they openly and honestly change their position and character and become anti-slavery parties in politics, than any manner or degree of political connection with any one of them, while they remain what they are at present, must be wrong in principle and disastrous in practice. How can two walk together, except they be agreed? How can a man serve two masters? How can he be the supporter of liberty, and yet mingle his political activities with the supporters of despotism? How can he fight the battles of freedom under the flag of the slave power?

In this country, it is well known that state, and county, and township, and city, and ward, and village officers, are, for the most part nominated and elected by the political parties that are characterized by their national politics; that these state and local nominations are made chiefly with the view of strengthening the parties, and thus promoting the great national objects the party has in view. The national politics are thus carried into the local elections.

To support the local candidates of the party, therefore, is to render effectual support to the national politics of the nominating party. And if these national politics are pro-slavery politics, as the national politics of every party except an anti-slavery party inevitably must be, then the support of these local candidates is an effective support of the slave power. For the question of liberty or slavery is (in its own changeless nature,) a question paramount to all other questions, and, of necessity, it will always become, practically, the great test question, in all parties, whether pro-slavery or anti-slavery in their character.

It has been objected to this view, that the policy of nominating state and local officers, in reference mainly to national questions, is bad policy; that local concerns are thus lost sight of, and local officers chosen in relation to objects over which they have no direct or official control. Be it so, for the sake of the argument. It remains true that the state and local candidates of all parties in this country are thus nominated. To support the local candidates of such parties, therefore, by the objector's own showing, is to do that which ought not to be done, for other reasons besides those which we have urged, and without at all impairing their force.

But there is another answer to the objection. We do not admit that in respect to the great and fundamental question of liberty or slavery, as involved in national politics, it is either wrong or unwise to make it a test question in all our local and municipal elections. It may be unwise and illiberal to require of a local candidate, (as is commonly required,) a virtual pledge to support a party founded on a sub-treasury or a national bank. It does not follow that he ought not to be pledged to fundamental morality in opposition to dishonesty—to liberty in opposition to slavery—to the fundamental principles of civil government, and against the elements of anarchy and despotic power.

On this principle it is, that oaths of office—of allegiance—of fealty to the Constitution—are required of those who hold office under our government. Is it wrong, narrow-minded, or impolitic, for the friends of liberty to require of their candidates, for whom they are to vote, that they practically recognize the first principles of the Declaration of Independence—that all men are created

equal? But how can they do this, while they permit themselves as voters, as candidates, and as holders of local offices, to be chained to the car of a great national pro-slavery party in politics, to bear its name, to carry its badge, to wear its livery, and to labor in its pay?

Experience has recently taught us, what a knowledge of mankind should have taught us long ago, that local, township, county, village, and city officers and candidates connected with the great national pro-slavery parties, and yet professing attachment to the principles of liberty, and commanding the confidence and the votes of abolitionists, are the most successful instruments of seduction; and that, through their influence, chiefly, the friends of liberty, to so great an extent, have been led to cast their votes in favor of a slaveholder for Vice President. And thus it has come to pass that we now have a slaveholding President of the U. S., elected by anti-slavery votes.

It is in the smaller and local elections that the great body of our citizens mingle in the activities of political life. There, if at all, they find the fields of usefulness, they are able to occupy. There it is that they expect to share in the responsibilities of office. The village and township and ward elections are to them the objects of the same interest that the higher elections are to those who are in a position to be affected by them. How manifestly futile, then, is the attempt to enlist the great mass of our citizens in a national contest against the slave power while at the same time they are encouraged to forget their free principles, and to act in concert with the friends of despotism, at the local elections, at the very points where their power is most felt, and their activity most effective! Very few men in the nation expect to fill the office of President, but tens and perhaps hundreds of thousands understand their competency to fill minor offices, and know of no good reason why they should not serve their fellow citizens in that way, if it can be done without a sacrifice of correct principles. What great national object will ever be attained without the co-operation of these men?

For what other object than to subserve its own unhallowed ends, should a party tied hand and foot in all its great national arrangements to the car of the slave power, select its local candidates from among the reputed advocates of liberty? Let it once be understood that the local, village candidate will not aid in the elevation of the national candidate; that the advocate of liberty, if nominated, will not be the advocate likewise of the national pro-slavery party, and the illusion vanishes at once; the nomination is reserved for a more available candidate.—To fail of supporting the Presidential candidate is to abjure the party, whose incarnation and personification the Presidential candidate himself is.

Thus demonstrable is it, that, in their political activities, at the local elections, there can be no compromise or truce between the friends of liberty and of slavery, in which the friends of liberty will not lose all and gain nothing—and the friends of slavery lose nothing and gain all. Thus it ever has been, in all attempted alliance between vice and virtue, between holiness and sin. Unless the friends of liberty make their own nominations, at all the town and county and village and city and ward elections, they will be divided against each other—they will vote against each other, and thus their old party predilections and antipathies will be perpetuated. They will continue to be jealous of each other, as they have hitherto been, and can never act in harmony, nor with mutual confidence in great national elections.

It has been found by experiment that county, township, village, and ward nominations and votes are among the most effectual measures for carrying the discussion of anti-slavery principles and measures into the minute ramifications of society—the most retiring and remote corners of the community. The question then presents itself in a practical form, in a place where its claims must be, in some manner, disposed of, and at a time when it can neither be evaded nor postponed.

Is it asked, What do you want of an anti-slavery justice of the peace? of an anti-slavery path-master? of an anti-slavery constable? of an anti-slavery coroner? of an anti-slavery assessor? of anti-slavery selectmen, or supervisors, or aldermen, or mayor?

We answer, in the first place, what do you want of pro-slavery incumbents of these offices? Anti-slavery or pro-slavery they must be; anti-slavery they cannot be, steadily and to any good purpose, while connected with a national pro-slavery party. Do you prefer such men to the known and uncompromising friends of human liberty? Are your interests safer in their hands?

We answer, in the second place, justices of the peace, in some of the States, decide upon the claims of southern kidnappers and the unfortunate and defenceless persons they seize as fugitive slaves. In other States, justices, assessors, supervisors, selectmen, &c., form the Boards of Excise for licensing or refusing to license the venders of strong drink. On their action it very much depends, whether a lawless and bacchanalian mob shall rule in this country, whether free discussion shall be permitted, whether our printing presses devoted to liberty shall be thrown down, whether our free public halls shall be burned, and our Lovejoys sacrificed to the popular fury, at the bidding of the slaveholder.

For the want of anti-slavery constables, hundreds of fugitive slaves, to say nothing of free people of color, have been seized and returned into hopeless bondage.—Should a constable be devoid of humanity? The executor of the laws—should he know little of the claims of justice and of mercy? The man who knows how to discharge manfully the duties of a constable, must be indeed whole man—a discriminating, a merciful, and yet prompt man. Produce the perfect model of a village constable, and you have in many important respects, the model of an efficient, and yet a law-abiding and a liberty-loving President. To say that a constable need not be an intelligent and faithful friend of liberty, is to say that liberty has nothing to do with a proper execution of the laws! Would you do well to deliver the unfortunate and the poor in our midst into the hands of constables who look with contempt upon the slave? Can you preserve a rational respect for civil government, if you commit the execution of the laws into the hands of men undeserving of respect?—men who make law and government odious by the brutality with which they enforce their demands?

A path-master or surveyor of the highways is the man under whose direction the free yeomanry of the country and their young sons are required to labor, day by day, on the public streets and roads. Is it indeed of no consequence whether this public officer has learned the important distinction between a laboring man and a working beast? If not, then let the friends of liberty decline the nomination of their own path-masters.

A coroner too, should be mentally and morally qualified to distinguish a MAN from a mere connecting link between man and the lower animals! And he should have a man's heart beating in his own bosom. He should account human life of equal and inestimable value, whether connected with a sable or pallid skin. Otherwise human life might be sacrificed at the North as it often is at the South, without the rebuke of the law, and in conformity with the usages of slavery.

Liberty is secure, or otherwise in any country, and especially in a republic, very much in proportion to the discrimination and faithfulness with which the municipal and village offices are placed in the hands of wise, independent and good men.

The vital point of connection between a civil government and its subjects lies just here, in the character of the local officers who come most in contact with the people, who mingle with them most freely, who touch them at the ten thousand points where no Grand Monarch could touch them, who see and watch them with the ten thousand Argus eyes which no President possesses; whose example, for good or evil, is most seen, and most extensively felt, and whose facilities are the greatest for infusing the spirit of the government into the hearts of the people. The Emperors of China and of Russia could not be despotic, were it not for their ten thousand aids and accomplices, who do their bidding in their official intercourse with the people. Who would tremble at the power of the Turkish Sultan, if all the subordinate and executive local offices of his empire could be retained in

the hands of intelligent, courageous and uncorruptible friends of freedom? Where were the power of a Tarquin or a Cæsar, if every local and subordinate officer were a Brutus? Who would fear the treachery of Cataline, the ambition of a Napoleon, or the cruelty of a bloody Mary Tudor, if every justice of the peace and constable and assessor, and path-master and coroner in the republic were a Hampden, a Sidney, a Tell, a John Knox, or a Samuel Adams?

A thrill of alarm would doubtless run like electricity through the nation, if it were seriously proposed that the President of the United States, (even though he were not the known tool of the slave power) should hold the appointment of all the path-masters, and coroners, and constables, and justices of the peace in the Republic. But if the friends of liberty have irrevocably made up their minds to have no hand in the selection of these officers, or if the great first principles of human rights are not to furnish the test by which they are to be selected, then the appointment might as well be left to the President as in any other hands.

The truth is, a disregard for human rights should, on all occasions, and every where, be considered a disqualification for civil office—whatever that office may be.—"He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God." "Judges and officers shalt thou make thee," said the Hebrew lawgiver, "in all the gates which the Lord thy God giveth thee, and they shall rule the people with just judgment." Whether the power were to be exercised on a broad or a narrow scale, whether at Jerusalem or at Dan, or at Beersheba, one unvarying rule—justice—a regard for human rights, this was the grand qualification, the *sine qua non*, without which, all other qualifications, were deemed insufficient. Nothing short of an adherence to this standard can preserve the liberties of either Hebrews or Americans. In all our gates, or depositories of power, whether at Washington City, at Harrisburgh, at Albany, at Boston, at Concord, or in the most obscure neighborhood where the path-master is chosen—"he that ruleth over men must be just."

Whoever gives his vote for any subordinate officer, endorses his character for integrity and a regard for human rights. This endorsement becomes, in a measure, his passport to higher offices, on the principle that "he who is faithful in the least is also faithful in much." The path-master becomes an assessor—the assessor a justine—the justice a State Legislator, a member of Congress—a President. An humble individual was chosen to the office of county clerk. The influence he acquired in this station carried him into the State Legislature. From this he became Governor of State—then a Senator, for eighteen years, in the Senate of the United States, where once and again, his voice decided great national questions. One individual whose vote contributed to elect him to the office of county clerk, was never able, perhaps, afterwards, to arrest his onward and upward march to power, however serious might have been his fears for the result on the public weal.

A friend of liberty votes for a candidate of doubtful firmness or of unfixed principle, to to represent him in the Legislature of the State. He is elected. The interests or wishes of the party that nominated him become the rule of his political action in that body. A Senator of the United States is to be chosen, and the member elected by the vote of the friend of liberty, casts his vote for a Senator subservient to the Slave Power. Thus it is that the friends of liberty, in this country, have done the bidding of slavery, for the last fifty years. Do we dream of producing an opposite result without swerving at all from the course marked out by the foot-prints of our fathers?

It has been urged that the Governors and Legislatures of the States, notwithstanding their connection with the national politics of their parties, have, in some instances, done much for the cause of liberty, and in conformity with the progress of public opinion they will do more—will do all that is requisite to be done. Why, then, it is earnestly asked, should the friends of liberty nominate candidates for State offices?

But is it probable that State Legislatures connected with national pro-slavery parties, and looking to the slaveholders for support to their Presidential candidates, will give us United States' Senators faithfully pledged against the slave power? That they will earnestly and perseveringly recommended the abolition of slavery in the Federal District—the prohibition of the inter-state slave-trade and other important national measures in favor of liberty? To suppose this, is to suppose that they will abandon the support of pro-slavery Presidents, and become connected with an anti-slavery party in politics—just such a one as the friends of liberty have already organized, and to which, fellow-citizens, we ask your support. Whenever they do this, we shall be with them, of course, because they will then have come over to the ground we now occupy. But present appearances, we fear, do not indicate that such will soon be their course. Certainly it will not be while the friends of liberty join with them, and help to fortify their present position.—The fear of the loss of votes, and of independent political action, by the friends of liberty, may indeed stimulate the rival parties, when nearly balanced, to take some farther steps, in State legislation, where that work has not already been completed. More than this, we think we ought not to anticipate. Nor ought we to expect that the stimulus of fear, (through which, chiefly, a correct State action has been thus far obtained,) can be longer made effective, unless our action shows that there is meaning in our professions.

While we would not forget, therefore, or undervalue the State action in favor of liberty, that has already taken place, we can find in it no solid ground of argument against the position we have assumed. We would not compromise the future, by our complacency with the past. In our gratitude for a few crumbs of encouragement to the slave, we would not ourselves, assist to rivet his fetters: "The ruse of gradualism," has too long and too often, and in two many deceptive forms, deluded the friends of liberty, hitherto. It is high time to break off all parley with a foe so deceitful—so rich in cunning, stratagems and expedients.

It will scarcely be claimed that (with a few brilliant exceptions) there is anything of hearty, intelligent, and manly attachment to the principles of liberty, and the cause of human rights, among the prominent candidates, we are invited by the other parties in our State elections to support. Such a plea in their favor could hardly be made unblushingly, by the side of the apology urged on their behalf, that they deem it impolitic to identify themselves with the friends of liberty, lest it should injure their party, deprive them of votes, or offend the women-whippers of the South. We ask whether the support of such candidates, and of such parties, becomes an American freeman, jealous of his country's honor, and anxious to secure and to promote human rights? Is it, indeed, the very best thing the friends of liberty, in this nineteenth century, & in this land of the pilgrims can do to rally round the standard set up by such parties? To support such candidates? Have we descended so low? And are we reduced to such straits? Is it to such claims as these that we are to surrender the policy of choosing *men* to represent men—republicans to embody republicanism—friends of liberty (generous, magnanimous, and self-denying) to fight the battles of liberty in the teeth of lawless power? Can we be tempted with such a bait, to abandon the heaven-attested principle, that "he that ruleth over men must be just"—that secu-

rity dwells only with integrity—that liberty lives only in the throbbing hearts of its sincere worshippers.

No,—whatever partial or temporary advantages may have been incidentally gained by mingling in the train and clinging to the skirts of the slave power, [and gained at the expense of the compromises which were their price] the time for such humiliating and questionable expedients has gone by. From the "dirty waters" of such "partizan politics," the friends of liberty are preparing to cleanse themselves, and to come up.

If there are gifted and honorable friends of liberty still connected with the servile parties, (as doubtless there are) they should be invited and encouraged by a correct example, to change their position. The more intelligent they are, the more comprehensive their views, the more discriminating their vision, the more gigantic their powers, the greater are the mischiefs of their error, the greater are our claims on their co-operation, and the less cause of complaint have they, on their part, that the friends of liberty do not honor them with their sufferings while they array themselves on the wrong side of a conflict, in which there can be no neutrality, and no middle ground.

It will doubtless be inquired of us, what features of a national policy we design and expect the men of our choice will pursue in the case of their election, in respect to those "other great interests," on account of which the claims of human liberty have hitherto been postponed, and which are commonly supposed to have no manner of connexion with the principles of human rights, as involved in the great slave question.

We answer:—

1. In the first place—Every political party and administration has its paramount object—its test questions. It has likewise its "minor questions"—its matters to be decided by mutual consultation; by "concessions"—it may be be—and in the light of its ever increasing wisdom under the guidance of a wise course of experimental endeavors.

What if the *liberty* party should have *its* test questions?—and suppose they should be emancipation—abolition—human freedom, instead of the price of cotton? Suppose "tariff,"—"Bank,"—"Sub-Treasury," and other topics of doubtful disputation among our wisest and best men, should be left open for future consideration?

Suppose our national councils were filled with hearty friends of human rights, seeking the good of the people, and pledged only to the doctrines of liberty, and of abolition remaining unpledged on the bank, currency, and tariff; questions, until they could gather wisdom from mutual discussions on the floor of Congress;—would not all the public interests be much safer in the keeping of such men than they are in the hands of men, pledged beforehand, to local, partial, and sectional interests, rather than to the great general good, as ascertained by free discussion, after Congress shall have assembled, for the very purpose of using its collective wisdom?

We hold it self-evident that legislators should be pledged, beforehand, to self-evident principles, and to corresponding measures, concerning which no honest and intelligent friends of liberty can differ. The unpledged points should be those concerning which there is a possibility of gaining further light by discussion.

2. We answer in the second place, that in respect to all the great financial, pecuniary, and money interests of the country, the abolition of slavery, includes in itself, as a mere measure of political economy, elements of relief, of enlightenment, and of prosperity, which are of vastly greater value and importance than all that can be accomplished either by tariffs, or free-trade, by Banks or Sub-Treasuries, by this, or that, or the other proposed mode of managing the national funds. These classes of measures lie manifestly on the surface—they are the mere forms of public wealth. And although there may be room for an intelligent choice between them, yet no impartial or reflecting economist, or statesman can claim for either of them anything more than comparative utility and minor importance. But the question of free or slave-labor is a question vital to the prosperity of any people—lying at the very basis of individual and national wealth.

3. We answer in the third place, that by the abolition of slavery, and by that measure only (or at least by the overthrow of the ascendancy of the slave power in the national councils) a termination can be put to the never ceasing fluctuations and destructive changes inflicted upon us by the slave power.

The free laboring north can thrive well enough comparatively speaking, either on the system of a protective tariff, or of free-trade—either with or without a sub-treasury, or a national bank. All it need ask is rational stability, security from capricious change, and from the hostile overturn of all its settled arrangements.

A security from change, for thirty years to come, in the great measures of national policy; [excepting of course the needed change from slave to free-labor, with the incidental modifications of policy that might grow out of it;] would be worth a hundred fold more than all the differences that can be supposed to arise from the advantages of the one proposed system of political economy or finance, over its rival.

4. We answer in the fourth place, that by the removal of the disturbing force of so unnatural an anomaly as the system of unpaid and compulsory labor, from the activities of human enterprise, a change might perhaps be wrought in the relative positions of things which should render totally unnecessary and unmeaning many questions of national policy now urged and debated as essential, both at the North and at the South. Measures now indispensible might be found wholly inadmissible.—and measures now hostile to the interests of the country, might then be found not only compatible with, but highly promotive of them.

When there shall no longer be a conflict between the opposing interests of free and slave labor, then and not until then, will it be possible for the wisest legislators on earth to determine with certainty and precision, the national policy that will be in every respect, best adapted to secure the common and then harmonious interests of the great, and united whole. And until that time, it will certainly be impossible, as it ever has been, to hit upon any system of policy which shall permanently satisfy the Southern States, or harmonize in any good degree, the interests of the North and of the South.

5. We answer in the fifth place, that the great doctrine of human rights involved in the question of abolition—in other words, the fundamental principles of human equality, equity, justice, mercy, humanity, regard for human nature as such, irrespective of factitious and artificial distinctions, and in opposition to arbitrary and aristocratic claims—these—the very elements and life-blood of Abolitionism, comprise not only the best, but the only sure standard and test by which all the apparently subordinate and doubtful questions of legislation and of political economy should be decided. It is only in the light of these great principles [which no administration but an anti slavery one will ever honestly embrace or thoroughly understand] that any clue can be found to those perplexing problems about which narrow-minded and mere self-politicians so constantly wrangle, without ever settling them at all, or placing them upon any permanent or sure basis.

The great end of human government is the protection of the rights of men, and the preservation of the public peace and safety, and where this end is duly regarded the advancement of the public prosperity cannot but be secured on the most equitable and stable basis.

Without undertaking therefore to foretell, precisely, every measure of political economy which a thoroughly abolitionized national administration, would find it proper to adopt, we may venture to specify a few things which such an administration would not do.

It would not buy itself perpetually with expedients to enhance the price of the products of slave-labor and to open markets for them in all parts of the known world, while it studiously avoided doing anything to procure a market for the free products of the grain-growing North-West.

In adjusting the details of a tariff of duties on imports it would not carefully tax the free born and exempt the planter who lives upon the labor of others. It would not

shut out foreign grown cotton from the manufacturers of the free North, while it exempted foreign manufactured goods from taxation, for the benefit of the slaveholding consumer.

It would not solicitously seek, as an object of great public concernment and utility, either by the aid of a Sub-Treasury, a National Bank, or any other instrumentality or institution devised for the purpose, an artificial and forced "equalization of exchanges" between the free laboring North and the spendthrift, dependant and poverty-stricken South; whereby the latter may be relieved from the disadvantages of their condition, by the manifest and gross robbery of the former. It would not shape its measures in conformity with the corrupt principle that wealth is the chief object of legislation, that its possession is the proof of merit, and that its acquisition is the great end of national policy, to the promotion of which, the social, intellectual and moral interests of man may be innocently sacrificed.

In disposing of the public lands, it would not select the methods best adapted to secure an inequality of distribution, for the especial benefit of slaveholders, at the expense and to the discouragement of the free laboring emigrant and settler. It would not seek to tax and restrict the free laboring States, in order to grant exclusive privileges and exemptions to the slaveholding South.

It would not plunge the country into needless, wicked, ruinous and disgraceful wars, especially with the red men of the forest on our frontiers. Least of all, would it do this, for the inglorious purpose of sending the hardy yeomanry of the North, at their own expense, at the bidding of the slave-holder, on the bloodhound errand of scenting the track of fugitive slaves across the ever-glades of Florida, and kidnapping men, women, children, and babes, for victims on the altar of slavery.

It would not violate fundamental morality, or invade human rights on any pleas of state necessity however plausibly or importunately they might be urged. It would not favor or tolerate unjust or anti-republican monopolies of any kind, to make the rich richer, and poor poorer, in any department of legislative action.

These things, we confidently hope and trust, the friends of liberty, in their associated political action, will not do.

In the activities of state, county, township, village, and city politics, the friends of impartial liberty and inalienable human rights, if true to their trust, will not fail to array themselves against those disgraceful and wicked arrangements through which vice is licensed by law, the morals of the people undermined by their professed and constitutional gurdians, and crime and pauperism created under the authority of the State for the emolument of gamblers, venders of strong drinks, and other paupers of vice.

Without assuming to decide what the course of our political associates shall be—we may venture to suggest to them the propriety of seeking such a change in the constitution of the United States as shall place the President and Vice President of the United States, in the hands of the people themselves, without the intervention of a college of electors, the votes to be counted and returned as at present, in States in which they are respectively given.

In a well directed and hearty endeavor to extend the benefits of education to the entire community, to the poor as well as to the rich, and wholly irrespective of color, caste, occupation and condition, the associated friends of liberty, we are persuaded, will not be found backward in giving a practical form and expression to their well known principle, that intelligence is incompatible with slavery, and that knowledge is the basis and bulwark of virtue and freedom.

With this expose of their views, the Convention indulge the hope, that in the minds of reflecting and good men they will not be thought to have lost sight of the various interests and objects to which the attention of a patriot and statesman should be directed, amidst the activities of political life. If charged with being men of one idea, in respect to public affairs, they ask that the comprehensiveness, and scope, and magnitude of that "*one idea*" may be well guaged, weighed, appreciated and understood.

It is the idea that "righteousness exalteth a nation, while sin is a reproach to any people." It is the idea that all human power is derived from the Creator of men, and unless wielded in conformity with his laws, must become a curse, instead of a blessing to mankind. It is the idea that law is for the preservation of rights. It is the idea that God governs the world—that it is always good policy to do right, and bad policy to do wrong.

Such an idea, we think sufficiently comprehensive to cover the entire ground of national policy, that the country now needs, and is vainly striving, by its present expedients to obtain. Such an idea we shall account it a sufficient honor to have embraced, and to have successfully laid at the basis of our national and State legislation.

In the realization of such an idea we look for the long-sought desideratum for elevating the great masses of mankind from the servility, degradation, vice, ignorance, and loss of self-respect which have, from age to age, made them the almost passive and unstruggling victims of arbitrary power. In demanding the redress of the slaves' wrongs, in the first place, as the great paramount object of our political endeavors, we do not forget that there may be other wrongs to be redressed. But we select, as most important, the case most palpable and immeasurably the most grievous and pressing—the case of the uncomplaining and the dumb, who cannot plead for themselves—the case of others as well as of our own. In this way only can those who seek other and minor reformations evince either the sincerity, the impartiality, or the consistency of their demands.

We invite our fellow-citizens, therefore, on [illegible] to effect with us in the righteous and truly republican and reformatory effort in which we are engaged, and we pledge ourselves never to abandon our ground until our republic is either regenerated by a return to its first principles, or subverted by its persevering and determined contempt of them.

In such a contest we have nothing to fear, but from apathy and unfaithfulness; and nothing to hope for, but from unbending integrity, and unwavering perseverance, under the Superintending Providence and favor of High Heaven.

ALVAN STEWART, *Chairman.*

JOSHUA LEAVITT, L. P. NOBLE, LEVI COFFIN, } *Secretaries.*

DECISION OF THE SUPREME COURT.

The decision of our Supreme Court has occasioned no small excitement, which only shows that for 39 years the clause of the Constitution, excluding slavery, has been in part a dead letter. A scurrilous handbill was got out in Covington, and the democratic editors of this place were so forgetful of what is due the state and their own dignity, as to republish it approvingly. It talks about "the total insecurity of our property," announces that, "in vain did our fathers struggle for independence, and security, if our chartered rights are to be frittered away by the quibbles of law"—wants to know whether the "harmony of our union can last much longer" —threatens, "if retribution is inflicted, woe betide the wretches who provoke it."—Alas for Cincinnati! who will come to her help against the great city of Covington? The valorous tone of the foregoing brought to their knees the democratic editors of the Cincinnati Enquirer. Poor men! they are lately from the interior of the state, and thought these Kentuckians were in earnest. They did not know so well how to understand their threats as some of us, who have been living in spite of them some five or six years. Accordingly, they appeal to the well-disposed of our cit-